QUEST FOR
AUTHORITY
IN EASTERN
AUSTRALIA

1835-1851

Michael Roe

QUEST FOR AUTHORITY
IN EASTERN AUSTRALIA

1835-1851

QUEST FOR AUTHORITY
IN EASTERN AUSTRALIA
1835-1851

MICHAEL ROE

*Senior Lecturer in History
University of Tasmania*

MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY PRESS
IN ASSOCIATION WITH
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

First published 1965

*Printed in Australia by Halstead Press, Kingsgrove, N.S.W.
for Melbourne University Press, Parkville N2, Victoria*

*Registered in Australia for transmission
by post as a book*

London and New York: Cambridge University Press

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many readers will recognize my debt to Manning Clark. My second supervisor at Canberra was L. F. Fitzhardinge, and the two provided a valuable dialectic. Others who have read and commented upon drafts are R. A. Gollan, D. H. Pike, A. G. L. Shaw, and K. S. Inglis; I have failed to realize all the improvements they suggested, but still their contribution is large. Further help has come from teachers, fellow-scholars, students, librarians, typists, friends, and family, in an abundance impossible to detail. The pertinent authorities have granted permission for my use of manuscript sources. Shortly before publication of this book my knowledge of its subject was enriched by the reading of another A.N.U. Doctoral thesis, John Barrett's 'Church, State and People in Eastern Australia, 1835-1850', to be published eventually by Melbourne University Press.

I offer the book to my wife.

Hobart
November 1963

MICHAEL ROE

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	v
Introduction	i

PART ONE CONSERVATISM

1 Conservative Ideology	13
2 Conservative Power	35

PART TWO FACTORS DISRUPTING CONSERVATISM

3 'That Gigantic Anomaly, the Squatting System of New South Wales'	61
4 Radical Politics: New Claims and Conflict	77
5 The Roman Catholic Church and its Members	103
6 Protestantism	125

PART THREE A NEW FAITH: MORAL ENLIGHTENMENT

7 The Faith, the Mind, and the Psyche	147
8 The Faith, the Will, and the Soul	165
9 The Impact of the Faith on Popular and Public Life	184

Appendices

I <i>Status and Number of Persons in New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania, 1841-51, their Occupations and Religious Affiliations</i>	207
II <i>Churches and Schools in New South Wales, Port Phillip, and Tasmania, 1850</i>	210
III <i>Imperial and Colonial Administrators</i>	211
<i>Abbreviations and Usages</i>	213
<i>Notes</i>	214
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	234
<i>Index</i>	249

INTRODUCTION

Australia's first European settlements were penal colonies consisting of a few free migrants, the convicts, and their rulers. Government rested on brute force as its means of compulsion. As settlement spread, the relative importance of the gaols declined and the penal method of government became inadequate. What new form of power was to take its place concerned all interests in the colonies. Presumptive heirs to the gaolers' supremacy sought an authority free both from Imperial control and from colonial rivals, but opposition to such claims arose from either side. New immigrants complicated the position as they brought from their homelands ideas and values which they sought to apply in their new surroundings. Around mid-century these clashing elements gave way before the authority of a new force, 'moral enlightenment'. This process was as exciting, and as difficult to define, as religious conversion. It was still proceeding when the new authority had to face exacting tests. Less than seventy years after the first convicts disembarked, the colonies endured the shocks of gold discovery (mid-1851), of self-government (1855-6), and of latter nineteenth-century civilization. The difficulty of these challenges tends now to lack appreciation, because of the very success with which they were met.

Comprehension of the new authority and its establishment demands knowledge of various aspects of colonial society. The contending parties in the struggle for power divided along several lines, which the censuses indicated.¹ Many residents (more than would admit to the census collector, no doubt) had come to Australia as convicts; most had since become free, but others remained under bond; yet others, and these were increasingly important, were free immigrants or native-born, groups between and within which animosities were sharp. Listings of employments showed many gradations, from 'Landed Proprietors, Merchants, Bankers and Professional Persons', to those people whom no specific category could enclose. Religion, which in part reflected the variety of national origin, largely within the British Isles, was a further source of division. Practically all persons declared themselves Christian, but the strength and variety of feeling inside that limit was proved both by nominal adherence and by statistics concerning churches and schools.² Literacy was another point of variation: the censuses of 1851 showed that in New South Wales and Victoria about one-third of all adults were not literate, being unable either to write or to read and write.

The various groups battled chiefly over five, often inter-related, issues: political authority, land policy, convict transportation, religion, and education. Concerning the first the Colonial Office retained much influence, exercised usually by the bureaucracy but sometimes by the

current Secretary of State for the Colonies.³ More powerful, however, were the colonial governors, despite the Judicature Acts of 1823 and 1828, by which they lost some authority to executive and legislative councils. The Executive Council comprised the Governor and the heads (all appointed from Downing Street) of the major administrative departments. The legislative councils included such officers and seven or eight private citizens nominated by the Governor.

Most colonists wanted more representative government than this, and kept on demanding it. In 1842 an Imperial Act granted New South Wales, which still embraced the future Victoria as its 'Port Phillip District', a new legislature. Twenty-four members were elected; and twelve, six officials and six non-officials, were nominated by the Governor. Candidates for election had to own substantial property, and a £20 franchise prevailed. The Governor no longer sat in Council, but remained head of the executive which was still subject to Imperial direction. The 1842 Act did not stifle colonial demands in New South Wales, and it inflamed them in Tasmania. The Australian Colonies Government Act of 1850 affected New South Wales only by constituting Victoria and reducing the franchise to £10; both the new colony and Tasmania henceforth had legislatures on the New South Wales model.

Land policy ranked next in importance. From the early days men had held land by grant from the Crown, by purchase from grantees, or by occupation. In the first two cases their tenure was virtually freehold; in the last, without any sanction of law. From 1829 the government sought to order the process of settlement in New South Wales by banning it outside the Nineteen Counties, which filled an arc some two hundred miles around Sydney. Further counties were later declared around Brisbane (Moreton Bay), Boyd Town, Melbourne, Geelong, and Portland. The Ripon Regulations of 1831, which applied to both New South Wales and Tasmania, halted grants of land and instituted its sale at a minimum of five shillings per acre. Now the government sought not only order, but profit. In New South Wales the Governor, Sir Richard Bourke, rigorously applied the new rules; in Tasmania Lieutenant Governor Sir George Arthur evaded their spirit by issuing many 'promises to grant' before they became operative, and henceforth the land issue had little importance in the island. In 1838 the price of all Australian land rose to twelve shillings an acre.

The following year Lord John Russell, Secretary of State for the Colonies, planned the 'dismemberment' of New South Wales; that is, division into Northern, Central, and Southern districts, in each of which the disposal of lands would be administered separately; in May, the Colonial Office instructed the Governor, Sir George Gipps, accordingly. But the hostility of the colonists of old New South Wales and the campaign they conducted in both Australia and England caused the plan to fall through. The only positive result was that in Port Phillip for some months up to August 1841 the minimum price of land was

£1 per acre, and a few special surveys of eight square miles were sold for £5,120. The Constitutional Act of 1842 stressed that land policy remained an Imperial concern. The coincidental Australian Land Sales Act increased the minimum price in both colonies to £1, sale to be by an amalgam of auction and uniform price systems. Though not formally restricted to the New South Wales counties, the Act probably had little effect on land elsewhere.

These measures had scarcely touched 'squatting', the unauthorized occupation of land, usually for grazing. In New South Wales the government sought continually to regulate this practice, but the problem proved intransigent. A climax came in April-May 1844, when Gipps advanced two sets of regulations. One provided for immediate leases, at a proposed fee of £10 per annum for every station—defined as an area of twenty square miles, or capable of running 4,000 sheep or 500 head of cattle, whichever was the greater. The other provided for eventual purchase, granting freehold over 320 acres and secure tenure over the rest of a station for eight years in return for £320. Again the colonists' opposition was strong enough to persuade the government to abandon its plans. Not until 1846-7 was any settlement reached. An Imperial Act, enforced by an Order in Council, divided New South Wales into settled, intermediate, and unsettled zones. In the first, leases were to be issued for one year; in the second, for eight years; in the third, for fourteen years. The fees were moderate, and occupants were promised extensive rights of pre-emption (confirmed by a further Order in 1850) and renewal. In practice, few squatters did more than lodge claims for leases, but this vested them with possession temporarily.

The transportation of convicts was another issue, ultimately to become bitterly controversial. In the mid-thirties convicts were assigned to private employment, usually with the big landlords. Transportation was thus a source of labour, but already it faced mounting opposition. In 1837-8 the Molesworth Committee of the House of Commons studied the system, and reported critically, especially of assignment, which in consequence was abandoned in 1840, and for the while transportation to New South Wales ceased altogether. In compensation, Tasman Peninsula and Norfolk Island were developed as special penal stations, and the probation system came into operation in Tasmania in 1842. Under this plan convicts spent the first part of their sentence in confinement, the later stages on the open labour market. Probation offered little to the colonists and was not efficient, so it won general ill-fame.

The British government therefore had to find a more satisfactory substitute for assignment. One move (1844-5) was to institute the 'exile' system, by which convicts holding tickets of leave or conditional pardons were sent to Port Phillip from both Britain and Tasmania. This was moderately effective. W. E. Gladstone, however, aimed at a more thorough solution. He promised to suspend transportation to Tasmania for two years; established the short-lived Gladstone penal colony on

the north-east coast; and suggested that New South Wales receive selected convicts. A committee of the New South Wales legislature reported in favour of the last proposal, although professing distress at the ultimate effects of transportation. So strong had popular feeling against convictism now become, however, that in September 1847 the Council repudiated its committee's support of Gladstone's plan.

Meanwhile the colonists of Tasmania were vehemently attacking the Imperial government for not having honoured Gladstone's promise of suspension. Earl Grey acknowledged the need for reform in February 1847, but two months later announced that henceforth ticket-of-leave holders would be sent from Britain to the island. Hostility grew yet stronger. Nor was Grey more successful in dealing with New South Wales. In 1847 he propounded a new scheme whereby the Imperial government would assist free migrants in ratio to the number of transportees accepted by the colony. In April the Legislative Council swung again, and accepted the plan. Grey then began to arrange the renewal of transportation, but left to one side the matter of free migration.

The result was a strong movement against transportation; meetings in Melbourne and Sydney protested against the landing of convicts from the ships *Hashemy* and *Randolph* (mid-1849), and various leagues were formed. Outstanding was the Australasian League for the Abolition of Transportation, begun in Launceston and formally constituted in Melbourne in February 1851. These efforts received perhaps a decisive impetus from the discovery of gold, and transportation to eastern Australia ended in 1853-4.

Another point at issue, of different order but no less involved than transportation, was state aid to religion. The Church of England received preferential treatment until the mid-thirties, although occasional help did go to other denominations. A qualitative change came with the local Church Acts 7 Wm. IV No. 3 (N.S.W.), 1 Vic. No. 16 and 2 Vic. No. 17 (Tas.). The first provided for a pound-to-pound subsidy, up to £1,000 to build churches for all Christian denominations; for ministers' stipends, up to £200 depending on the size of the congregation; and for the outfit and passage money of ministers and teachers. The Tasmanian Acts named only the Churches of England, Scotland, and Rome, though in fact other denominations received a little help. The provision for church building was similar to that in New South Wales, while the nominal maximum for a stipend was £400.

The administration of these Acts has never received close study, and remains obscure. In Tasmania the Treasury soon found the burden too heavy, and the Acts 4 Vic. No. 16 and 5 Vic. No. 9 restricted claims under the earlier legislation. The financial Estimates for 1851 reserved £15,925 for religious purposes, which sum would maintain forty-one Anglican, ten Presbyterian, and four Roman Catholic clergy. The Wesleyans received a grant of £500, and the Baptists £150. In New South Wales the position had altered a little with the 1842 Constitution

Act, which set aside (in Schedule C) £30,000 annually for religious purposes, a sum that Gipps feared might prove inadequate. In 1845 the local and Imperial governments agreed that the relative strength of the denominations at the 1841 census should determine the division, but the demand for subsidies fell in the later forties—in 1849 actual expenditure had been £28,946, which maintained sixty-three Anglicans, thirty-five Roman Catholics, seventeen Presbyterians, and five Methodists—and the £30,000 met all needs. So the Estimates for 1851 simply set down that sum.

Aid for the churches was closely entwined with the final great controversy: what educational system the government should promote by its allocation of funds. The provision of schooling had begun in the 1790s; soon the different religious groups devoted a good deal of attention to it and there were numerous private schoolteachers. Governments felt obliged to see that a reasonably comprehensive system prevailed. Up to the mid-thirties denominational schools received funds in much the same way as did the churches. Bourke planned to treat this issue in accord with the spirit of the Church Acts. Believing that denominational segregation was unfortunate in itself and wasted resources by duplicating schools in some areas while others went untended, he proposed (1836) that the state should support only those schools conducted on the 'National' plan. Also known as the 'Irish' and the 'Stanley' system, this sought to provide religious teaching acceptable to all major denominations, Catholic and Protestant. Hostility to the move developed, however, and so the old haphazard procedures continued. In 1839-40 Gipps suggested that the Roman Catholics have separate schools, while all the rest come under the system developed by the British and Foreign Schools' Society, which taught an amorphous Protestantism. The legislature did not agree. Yet feeling for reform continued to grow, and was evident in the newly elected Council. In 1844 the National system was endorsed by an important committee of the legislature which studied the question. A narrow majority of the whole Council agreed, but now the government declined to act. Not until 1848 was a new plan devised. Separate boards were to administer denominational and National schools and to supervise the grant of funds to both. Critics of church schools continued restive, but the compromise of 1848 stood firm for the while.

In Tasmania Lieutenant Governor Sir John Franklin had tackled the issue in much the same way as Gipps originally planned. From 1838 a modified British and Foreign system prevailed, though a few Roman Catholic schools also received aid. Franklin's system had to suffer much criticism, however, and the matter finally went to Downing Street, whence in 1844 Lord Stanley suggested that Tasmania follow the ruling New South Wales system. The current Lieutenant Governor, Sir Eardley Eardley-Wilmot responded by appointing a committee of enquiry which, like himself, preferred continuance of the *status quo*. W. E. Gladstone, then Secretary for the Colonies, disagreed, and ordered

that the state aid denominational schools. Lieutenant Governor W. T. Denison carried through this instruction, so that by 1850 the major difference between the colonies was that government schools in New South Wales taught by the National system, while those in Tasmania copied the British and Foreign model. A major change came about in the island in 1854, when aid to denominationalism virtually ended.

* * *

The presence both of divisions within society and of issues that inflamed them stressed the need for a successor to the authority of brute force. Was it to be the charisma of an individual or a small group of men; sheer virtuosity on the part of governments; or the dominance of some set of ideas? This essay argues that the last prevailed, in the shape of moral enlightenment. It had not yet determined the outcome of all public controversies, but at least promised their solution. It had won neither unanimous nor total acceptance, but did spread wide among thinkers and census ciphers alike.

Part III of the book describes moral enlightenment. A growth from eighteenth-century thought, this faith mingled Romantic, Protestant, and liberal attitudes. It was developed especially by upholders of secular culture and of the Temperance movement, who urged that everyone could, indeed must, become good, wise, prosperous, and responsible. All aspects of human personality—reason, will, instinct, imagination, spirit—might help towards this end. Perception of so happy a fate, and striving towards it, would impregnate society and bind it together. Older forms of control would become void and evil.

The four chapters of Part II study various factors—the squatting movement, radical politics, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism—which in different ways helped moral enlightenment to victory. The contributions were important, but largely indirect. They lay in that these elements thwarted the triumph of an alternative authority; one which the Imperial government sought to establish during the 1820s, having realized that New South Wales had grown beyond a prison farm.

This alternative force was the 'Conservatism' described in Part I. Its two pillars—one of ideas, one of interests—were the Church of England and a landed gentry. Some other groups gave support. Architects of the design were Earl Bathurst, Secretary of State 1812-27, and J. T. Bigge, sent by Bathurst in 1819 to investigate Australian conditions. Their concept is the background to this study, and provides the criterion for describing a person or institution as 'conservative'. The book does not attempt to relate the planting and early growth of conservatism but takes up the story when, never fostered with all the care necessary for survival, it had to face its crisis. Time and space and growth all undercut the Bathurst-Bigge design, yet its upholders fought back, demanding attention. Their failure was nearly as significant and as interesting as any success in Australian history.

The maps seek only to indicate those features mentioned in the text. In addition, the following districts are mentioned but do not appear in the maps:

O'Connell Plains: on the Fish River, about 20 miles east of Bathurst
Jerry's Plains: on the south bank of the Hunter River, between Singleton and Denman

Patrick's Plains: on the Hunter River, near Singleton

Brisbane Water: south of Lake Macquarie

Molonglo Plains: south-west of Queanbeyan

Illawarra: the coastal area between Wollongong and Nowra

Cumberland was the county immediately around Sydney; Cook and Westmoreland, which together formed an electoral district, were to the west and south-west of Cumberland.

Some names have become obsolete in the intervening years. Wellington is more often used than Wellington Valley and O'Connell Plains is now known as O'Connell; Patrick's Plains is not in common use. In Tasmania, the Huon River settlement has become Huonville and Brown's River settlement Kingston.

The Sydney suburb of Gladesville now stands on Tarban Creek; Boyd Town is near the present Eden; the Moreton Bay District is the south-eastern part of Queensland.

Victoria and south-east South Australia

Tasmania

New South Wales and south Queensland

PART ONE

Conservatism

I

CONSERVATIVE IDEOLOGY

The Church of England

THE EARLY HISTORY of the Church of England in Australia had little distinction. The Imperial government was tardy in appointing a chaplain to the First Fleet, thus displaying eighteenth-century scepticism towards both religion and the future development of the gaol settlement. That the appointee, Richard Johnson, had Moravian-Methodist sympathies, further suggested the government's indifference to the established Church. Nor did the Church show itself concerned with these proceedings. The religious factor in European colonization perhaps reached its nadir in the settlement of Australia.

Indifference prevailed for some thirty years. In Britain the one eminent churchman to show interest in colonial affairs was William Wilberforce, who expostulated at length, but often inaccurately and to little effect. In the colony the Church's representatives added little to her glory. Johnson had some sense of history, yet his efforts to meet its challenge were vain; and his failures were pathetic rather than tragic. Samuel Marsden arrived in the colony in March 1794 as Johnson's assistant, and after the latter's departure in September 1800 was the sole official chaplain for nine years. He was a man of humble background and education, and somewhat rough-hewn. Unlike Johnson, Marsden threw himself into the life of New South Wales. Historians have often presented him as a businessman avid for lucre and a magistrate cruel with the lash. The verdict is too harsh; these faults were certainly not unique to Marsden, and he had energy enough to carry out the work of the Church as well as his secular interests. He was, moreover, aware of the dignity of his position. The long quarrel the chaplain pursued with Lachlan Macquarie (Governor, 1810-21) arose in part from his asserting the rights of the Church against the demands of the state. Hints of that eternal conflict had appeared still earlier, when Johnson berated the early governors for not hastening to build a church.

The failure of Marsden, his predecessor, and his assistants from 1810 (Henry Fulton, William Cowper, and Robert Cartwright) sprang from more than personal idiosyncrasies. They lacked funds, prestige, recognition as vital instruments in the creation of society—deficiencies that were aggravated by their drab origins and their emphasis on a theology of personal grace. Meanwhile, a different message had come from

Tasmania. Robert Knopwood (sole chaplain 1803-19) was well born and did know the Church's traditional power. Yet he was living proof of the eighteenth-century degeneration of the Anglican ideal. Worldly pleasures had captured him, and faith lost its meaning.

This background gave added meaning to the change which followed the investigations of J. T. Bigge, who was less important in this matter than his secretary, Thomas Hobbes Scott. Scott wrote his own supplementary reports on religion and education. These, falling on Bathurst's ready ears, led to the establishment of the Church and Schools Corporation, which promised to vest permanent and exclusive wealth in the Church of England. More immediately, they led to the appointment of an Archdeacon as head of the local Anglican Church. The post went to Scott himself. Perhaps jobbery played some part in his original recommendations; but Scott's plan, as Bathurst saw, was a natural complement to Bigge's aim of building society on idealized-English lines.

Scott was never happy as Archdeacon. Hopes that the Australian Church might gain power relatively equal to that of its parent were already fading before his retirement in 1828. Yet no year was more important in Anglican history, for Scott was succeeded by William Grant Broughton, later to become Bishop of Australia (1835), and finally Metropolitan and Bishop of Sydney (1847). Pure and sweet of character, Broughton dedicated his considerable abilities to strengthening the Church in Australia. His personal letters (especially to Edward Coleridge, master at Eton) and public actions expressed a view of society remarkable for its militant conservatism. Other episcopal leaders were Francis Russell Nixon (Tasmania 1842), Charles Perry (Melbourne 1847), and William Tyrrell (Newcastle 1847). Nixon was a fascinating man, though not wholly attractive. Talent, vanity, ambition, intellect, all were prominent in his flamboyant, even sensuous nature. Naples was his spiritual home; Hobart, one suspects, his gaol.¹ Perry, by contrast, was a typical upper-class Englishman—cool, confident, competent. Tyrrell, a celibate, equalled Broughton in devotion to work and in sheer achievement. Alone of the pioneer bishops, he died in Australia.

Just as Marsden and Knopwood reflected the weaknesses of the eighteenth-century Church, so their successors drew strength from its revival. The Tractarian movement, emphasizing the Church's catholicity, its tradition, its holiness, inspired Tyrrell and Nixon and many others. Broughton himself was sympathetic, finding in the early work of E. B. Pusey, J. H. Newman, and John Keble a message for which he had felt an intuitive need. The influence of Tractarianism on him should not be exaggerated, however: Broughton's policies and attitudes followed continuously the course he set on his arrival in Australia, years before the first Tract appeared in Oxford. Perry was a good and effective bishop, whose Evangelical outlook in some ways made the common task less dismaying to him than to his High Church brethren. Moreover, 'Puseyism'—as its enemies usually described the new doctrine—

had its disadvantages: it both gave force to a Low Church reaction (see Chapter 6), which modified Anglican conservatism, and it influenced two of Broughton's clergy, T. C. Makinson and R. K. Sconce, to follow Newman's course to Rome (1848).

Whatever the effect of Tractarianism, the Church's material strength increased remarkably. By the test of churches, schools, and clergy, as well as nominal adherents, she remained well ahead of other denominations. Broughton strove to establish a theological college, a library, and St Andrew's Cathedral. Everywhere the laity organized for various purposes—parochial, missionary, cultural. Four times in Sydney, once in Melbourne, and twice in Hobart journals of Church opinion appeared, admittedly without great success.² In 1850 a conference of the Australasian bishops formulated a basis for unity and co-operation.³ Despite many stresses, the Church probably had greater energy and inspiration in the forties than at any other period of her Australian history.

Many churchmen in Australia believed that their situation was enormously significant. 'The question now at issue', Broughton told Coleridge, 'is really a very great one: no less than whether pure Christianity shall flourish or not over a sixth part of the habitable world.'⁴ All around him, the apostles of false religion strove for dominance, encouraged by that leniency which had allowed the official establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland ('schism thereby legalised') and the 'Romanist Emancipation' of 1829. 'The sour and wrong-headed determination of the Scotch' and 'that class, which creates so much turbulence in Ireland' both threatened his own ideals.⁵ Nor was this simply a matter of religion: 'if the presbyterians and dissenters carry the point . . . republicanism will be triumphant in the same proportion: and if the Papists gain ascendancy . . . what are we to look for but a spiritual and political despotism?'⁶ The Papists, moreover, were consolidating their secular influence by alliance with men 'of a Socinian or Deistical, in one word of a *liberal* turn',⁷ while from a further extreme emanated 'anti-monarchical and levelling principles . . . of the voluntary Church system'. Even some of his own clergy encouraged 'a self-will, destructive of unity'. Broughton recognized the current tendency for all men to 'think themselves qualified and privileged to rely on the exclusive guidance of their own will',⁸ but the knowledge only steeled his opposition.

One of the most interesting Anglican priests in the colonies was Henry Phibbs Fry, of Hobart, who in the forties was a fervent Tractarian, later an equally staunch Evangelical. Midway through his earlier phase he edited the local Church's *Herald of Tasmania*, the first editorial of which argued the divine origin of the state and man's duty under God to obey its ministers. Fry explained the need to make such principles crystal clear:

in countries endowed with ancient and established institutions, the tranquil majority, content to enjoy and not dispute, regard with indifference the ineffectual though ardent discussions of the lovers of

change: but, where numerous measures and ordinances are to be framed and moulded into a social system, the passive forbearance and silent judgements of the temperate and retired are in danger of being overcome by the less numerous but vehement partizans of extreme principles.⁹

This sensitivity to the difficulties of the Australian environment was common: 'here there were none of those silent holy rites which at home spread their unseen and unsuspected influences through the nation', cried the Anglicans;¹⁰ 'new ties, new habits, new occupations, engender a new train of ideas', wrote Nixon, as if in antiphony.¹¹

Broughton was no less disturbed. He pointed out, for instance, that free migrants passionately wanted

to make money and to raise themselves in the scale of society; and in the endeavour to do this, some (that is a great many) will break through all sumptuary regulations: and some (that is not a few) will lose their respect for moral obligations.¹²

This applied even—nay, especially—to the upper-class pastoralists. Their 'one intense effort to grasp unbounded acres and uncountable flocks' encouraged irreligion and that 'spirit of self-will' so loathed by the Bishop.¹³ In politics this group threatened to curse Australia with the worst of governments—an oligarchy dependent on mob favour. The condition of native-born Australians encouraged such trends:

there is no such feeling in the minds of those who were *born here* as that of loyalty, or of veneration for the dominion under which they live. We find it impossible to make them comprehend even what is meant by it. . . . They soon pick up the shibboleth of democracy; but of monarchy and its concomitants we see nothing and they . . . consequently know nothing.¹⁴

The fear of democracy bulked large in Broughton's mind: 'in all such communities as this', he wrote, 'the people have a tendency to it . . . the natural man likes it and there is but little here to curb the natural man's propensities'.¹⁵ His own credo was very different: 'ordinary men never know how to act for themselves in seasons of difficulty if their responsible advisers are silent'.¹⁶ He believed the £20 franchise set by the 1842 Constitution too low and rejected any qualification for the franchise other than property.¹⁷ T. H. Braim, an Anglican schoolmaster and future parson, was a more liberal churchman than his Bishop but held much the same political views, deploring 'factious opposition to constituted authorities' and 'all the evils flowing from radicalism and "mobocracy"'.¹⁸ Another clergyman, E. G. Pryce, saw boundless prosperity as the chief incitement to colonial anarchy, and consequently believed that 'there could scarcely have been a greater temporal good' than the sharp fall in wages in the early forties.¹⁹

Such attitudes prompted Anglican leaders to align themselves with

the higher ranks of society. Broughton, writing to Coleridge on 17 February 1842, envisaged a colonial House of Lords which might encourage loyalty and adherence to English ways. He particularly deplored the pastoralists' preoccupation with worldly matters, because among them he had hoped to find his best supporters. Only with great reluctance did he admit some wealthy tradesmen to the inner councils of the Church.²⁰ Perry sought money from England to pursue

the cultivation, upon Christian principles, of such intercourse with the upper class of residents in the city, and with the settlers who are in the habit of visiting it, as may, with God's blessing, render them kindly disposed towards myself and my brethren.²¹

As he told Broughton, in a letter of mid-1850, he found the comparative scarcity of this class a burden to his work. On the other hand, J. D. Lang complained that many Presbyterians went over to episcopacy for reasons of social prestige,²² and the Church certainly received support from some notable men. One was the young Charles Cowper, future Premier of New South Wales and son of the pioneer chaplain, who won election to the first legislature on a programme of support for 'Ultra Church Principles',²³ and over the next few years lived to his promise. His election must have compensated Broughton for discovering during the campaign that the 'plague spot of liberality' had infected his highest lay councils,²⁴ some members of which supported the candidature in Sydney of Captain M. C. O'Connell, representative of all that Broughton most disliked. Always strong under his calm demeanour, he forced their resignation.

The Church, with a few exceptions, was united against the continuance of transportation. So were many other groups, but the Anglican arguments had a distinctive twist. Nixon set the tone of these objections: 'a convict population is a kind of chaos, a vast society, yet most unsocial'.²⁵ Transportation, his clergy agreed, had forced men into communities that lacked the natural institutions of home and family; the consequence was 'unnatural crime'.²⁶ Another statement from this group declared that

if criminals continue to be transported to this colony, your Majesty's petitioners, as ministers of peace, cannot but tremble at the permanent establishment of a spirit of exasperation, and of most unhappy division pervading the entire social system; seriously impeding the efforts of your Majesty's petitioners to promote the extension and continuance of Christian peace and love. . . .²⁷

A strong group of New South Wales clergy petitioned in similar terms, emphasizing that transportation thwarted their efforts to make good their 'solemn pledge and obligation to maintain and set forward quietness and peace'.²⁸

Yet despite his sympathy for its 'noble object', Broughton on one

occasion refused the use of an Anglican schoolroom to the anti-transportationist Australasian League.²⁹ Here, in graphic form, was a characteristic of the Church of England which will recur: a refusal to let mass-secular movements, however fashionable, become part of religion. Christianity spoke to man's eternal soul, not his temporal welfare; it found expression in the Church, not civil society.

* * *

The philosophy and the power of the Church are also evident in its relation to the state and to the education controversy. The Anglican leaders refused to accept the 1836-7 Church legislation as reducing them to equality with other denominations and to dependence on government bounty. As late as 1845 Broughton warned against multi-establishment that it

countenances the assumption that the State is under no obligation to entertain any impression as to the superior correctness of one system of religious belief compared with other forms of doctrine. The tendency of this . . . is to nourish . . . a vacillation and unsteadiness of religious principle, which threatens finally to subside into actual unbelief. If the influence of Government be continually applied to abolish all concern for the distinction between true and false, the sense of moral obligation, I fear, will be gradually undermined; and the bond of integrity by which society is held together must be fatally relaxed.³⁰

Archdeacon William Hutchins, head of the Tasmanian Church from 1837 to 1841, emphatically dissented from the legislation there. Nixon endorsed his stand, and also his wish to secure permanent landed endowment for the Church.³¹ The latter project was especially dear to Hutchins's successor as Archdeacon, F. A. Marriott, who strove, unsuccessfully, to win over both home and colonial governments.³² Two eminent judges, W. W. Burton in New South Wales and John Pedder in Tasmania, agreed that, the 1836-7 legislation notwithstanding, the Anglican Church alone was established by constitutional law in Australia.

The Church continued to enjoy certain distinctions. Broughton sat on the nominee legislature until its abolition, and remained on the Executive Council until 1846. Neither Bourke nor the Colonial Office wanted him to continue in the former position after 1835, but Broughton insisted that an earlier promise be honoured. To stand down, he argued, would involve 'exposing me personally to an unmerited forfeiture of a lawful right, and the Church of England, and my sacred office at once, to what in the eyes of the world must be an apparent degradation'.³³ As a councillor he strove to give loyal and responsible service, without ever suppressing his own beliefs. He was honoured by election to the chair of all committees on which he sat, most notably the near-annual enquiries into immigration. The reports he prepared made such points as the undesirability of coolie migration and of 'excessive' inflow from Ireland.³⁴ neither group would easily mould to the Anglican pattern.

He strove, although with only small effect, to persuade the Council to enforce Sabbath observance.³⁵ Much more important, Broughton worked out a scheme to contain squatting that anticipated and even shaped Gipps's own solution of the problem. Agreement on this issue brought the Bishop and the Governor, at first antipathetic, very close together.

Broughton finally withdrew from the councils on his own initiative, fancying that to continue might draw the Church into controversy and ill-favour.³⁶ Nixon's attitude was rather different: like earlier leaders of the local Church, he took a seat on the Executive Council and remained there throughout the period. Moreover he sought to regain the right, lost during Hutchins's term, of the Anglican leader to sit in the legislature.³⁷ Neither the Lieutenant Governor nor the Secretary of State accepted his arguments.

The Church's jurisdiction over its clergy raised another aspect of its relations with the state, for here was an area in which the two authorities could, and did, clash. The issue became most important in Tasmania, partly because of Nixon's personal attitudes, partly because of the presence in the island of full-time convict chaplains. Lieutenant Governor Eardley-Wilmot's claim that they were under his direction was denied by Nixon. In specific cases the two differed, violently. Mrs Nixon wrote to England that the government was planning the overthrow of the Church; the Bishop himself that 'upon this I have quietly and deliberately resolved—to fight the battle out to the end, but *not* to remain as the mere nominal head of the Church, without power, influence, authority, or freedom'.³⁸ He was, perhaps, all the more galled by having learned that two young Anglicans, J. P. Gell and William Bedford jnr, were powers behind the previous government.³⁹

Consequently Nixon refused to ordain or license the convict chaplains; he forced Marriott to resign from their superintendency; and he set off for England to persuade the Colonial Office to agree that the Letters Patent that appointed him implied the right to set up a Consistorial (that is, an intra-Church) Court on the English model. In a militant speech immediately before departure he declared:

in these shifting days, the Secretary of State may be a Romanist, a Presbyterian, an Unitarian, a Dissenter, nay even an Unbeliever; for these are not the times when the State feels it a duty to watch with jealous care over the high principle of Christian truth as exhibited in the Church of England, or when soundness in the 'faith once delivered to the Saints,' is likely to be regarded as a necessary qualification for a Minister of State.⁴⁰

His lobbying of the Colonial Office was equally energetic and spirited, but it resulted only in the specific limitation of his privileges.⁴¹

At this level, therefore, Nixon lost the battle; but in its course he had destroyed his great adversary, Eardley-Wilmot.⁴² From 1844 the

Bishop had criticized the Lieutenant Governor to several correspondents, including Broughton and Coleridge. Coleridge carried the tale to W. E. Gladstone, that ardent young man who had entered politics in order to serve the Church and who became Secretary of State for the Colonies in November 1845. Five months later he dismissed Eardley-Wilmot. A public reason was the mismanagement of the convict system; a secret reason, the Lieutenant Governor's personal immorality; a third, perhaps decisive reason, the power of the Church of England. The Anglican leaders might have been pleased, but they were not proud of their work. Nixon refused to extricate Gladstone from the difficulties which Eardley-Wilmot's dismissal caused him at his next election; Broughton falsely maintained that he had not spoken ill of Eardley-Wilmot in homeward letters.

Broughton kept a firm hand over his ministers, and did not hesitate to call a Consistorial Court when need arose. However, it proceeded with great tact, so that no replica of the Tasmanian situation ever threatened. When a challenge to the Bishop did come, it was not from the government but from Robert Lowe, the brilliant Englishman who added so much vigour to New South Wales politics during the forties. A firm anti-Tractarian, Lowe twice sought to persuade the legislature to limit Broughton's authority: in 1846 he proposed a Bill which would vest the freehold of every benefice in a lay committee; and in 1849 he called for papers relative to the Bishop's disciplinary action against two young Evangelicals.⁴³ The general respect for Broughton and his deliberate passivity saved him from humiliation on either occasion. He was disturbed when Perry sought to clear the confusion by having the Council legislate for the government of the Melbourne diocese.⁴⁴ The encouragement that Perry's draft Bills offered to lay participation further damned them in the Metropolitan's eyes. The move ceased, and the 1850 Conference formulated a working compromise.

Overall, then, Broughton and Nixon gradually moved apart as they faced the problem of relations with secular authority. Both were sensitive to the danger to the Church of having no valuable exclusive privileges yet being used as a tool of government and bearing the consequent odium. Nixon chose to fight for the re-creation of the English position; Broughton, perhaps the better Tractarian in this, moved towards dissociation from the state while still criticizing multi-establishment. This tendency was apparent in his protest against Franklin's appointing, without any reference to himself, a temporary head of the Tasmanian Church following Hutchins's death;⁴⁵ it became increasingly evident in his withdrawal from the Councils and in the various episodes of the clerical-discipline story. As early as October 1844 Broughton even suggested in a letter to Coleridge that, were suitable men ready and willing, further bishoprics should be created in Australia without reference to the Colonial Office.

Yet otherwise Broughton clung tenaciously to the remnants of super-

iority. In particular he contested state recognition of Roman Catholicism. In 1837 and 1839 J. B. Polding, then holding only a titular see, was received by the Governor in circumstances which the Anglican saw as constituting recognition of his rival's episcopal status. Formal protests were entered, but without effect. Broughton's worst fears were confirmed in 1842 when Rome vested Polding with the territorial title, Archbishop of Sydney, and proceeded to make further episcopal appointments throughout Australia. Broughton truly forecast that if this were allowed, Papacy would soon appear in the same forthright guise throughout the Empire. He feared and opposed Polding's plan to redistribute state aid according to the numerical strength of each denomination.⁴⁶ The possibility of a Roman Catholic succeeding James Dowling as Chief Justice appalled him: in letter after letter he exhorted Coleridge to prevent such a catastrophe. Right at the end of the decade Broughton waged a (more or less successful) battle against Earl Grey's decree that a Roman Archbishop have precedence over an Anglican Bishop. During the brief operation of this rule he ordered his clergy not to attend a Government House levee, and himself refused to serve with Polding on a charitable committee.⁴⁷ Meanwhile both Nixon and Perry had expressed hostility to the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops in their dioceses. When Perry was rebuked for his lack of charity, he responded with an attack on 'infidel latitudinarianism' that would have done credit to any Tractarian.⁴⁸

A few samples from the Sydney diocese illustrate the many occasions when the Church protested against government policies. Broughton opposed plans for separating Port Phillip from New South Wales proper, arguing that this would further weaken the ties that bound the colony to the British constitution and would foster the ravages of democracy.⁴⁹ His opposition to the sale of the lands assigned to the old Church and Schools Corporation demonstrated his hankering after exclusive establishment.⁵⁰ His objections to the abolishing of the official grant for ministers itinerating beyond the boundaries were a routine method of exerting political pressure.⁵¹ The 'dissociation from secular authority' theme came out in Broughton's antagonism to a local Act which set up a multi-denominational cemetery and abrogated the Bishop's right to determine burial procedure. The incident was further notable in that the Colonial Office responded to his protests with rare goodwill, while the Church expressed its independence of government and other creeds alike by founding its own cemetery.⁵²

The education issue was a problem of relations between Church and state that also prompted expression of Anglican views on salvation and society. Relentlessly Broughton fought the successive plans of the government to subsidize only multi-denominational schools. Rather than have young Anglicans suffer under any such system, he told Coleridge in July 1836, he was prepared to establish voluntary schools. By right, however, the state should maintain denominational education. Broughton

did not make the claim for his Church alone; at this level he always took the 'dissociation' position. The settlement of 1848 was a triumph for the Bishop, and the figures cited in Appendix II show how well the Church maintained its pedagogic role.

In Tasmania the conflict was yet sharper. Franklin's imposition of the British and Foreign scheme provoked ever-deepening Anglican hostility. It was a campaign led by Fry and a layman named J. D. Loch which forced Eardley-Wilmot, hostile to exclusivism, to submit the issue to Downing Street.⁵³ Gladstone again responded to his faith in ordering modification: the Lieutenant Governor's views on education may have spelled his doom. The figures in Appendix II demonstrate that Nixon too made full use of his victory.

The recurrent Anglican theme throughout these disputes was that secular knowledge had no intrinsic virtue; that without the foundation of true belief it could become an instrument of evil. 'It is not to the all-pervading influence of literature and science that we must look for the regeneration of a fallen world like ours', argued Hutchins in an early attack on the Tasmanian system; 'but to that of Christian truth, set home to the heart by the ever-blessed Spirit'.⁵⁴ Broughton repeatedly argued the same point with equal firmness, though less concisely. Thus he charged his clergy at the height of the 1844 crisis:

I can but express my own confirmed and painful conviction, that the adoption of the now favourite theories of general education, founded upon an exclusion of the Church from its appointed province, would but aggravate the evil which it is designed to remove. In place of the opposition which Truth has now to encounter from rooted ignorance, there would be substituted a more embittered spirit of opposition from unsanctified knowledge; vice, in the meanwhile being not diminished in amount, but rendered only more specious and refined.⁵⁵

This theme went even further at an early meeting of the Church of England Book Society in Sydney. 'Desire for knowledge strongly tends to foster a spirit of infidelity', declared the Reverend W. B. Clarke, who urged his listeners to conquer 'this infidel tendency of the age' with its own weapons.⁵⁶

The Church was very active in providing superior education. In espousing this cause Nixon once referred to 'the character that may be impressed upon the higher classes' and 'those hidden bonds . . . by which alone a nation can hold together';⁵⁷ the conjunction illustrated why Anglicans felt so strongly on this point. In Hobart a grammar school had been conducted on Anglican lines since the mid-thirties. Then Franklin arranged the immigration of J. P. Gell, intending to appoint him head of a college of near-university standing. Gell was a loyal Anglican, a pupil of Thomas Arnold's, and a disciple of

learning of that higher order which associates the sentiments with all that is stable and permanent . . . which not only teaches facts, but

inculcates principles and teaches uniform habits by the instrumentality of religious discipline and venerable institutions.⁵⁸

His views on social class were similar to Broughton's, and he lamented the current system of primary education as 'putting the weapon of learning into the hands of the people, and leaving it to an independent priesthood to form the popular faith'.⁵⁹

The proposed college was strongly criticized, primarily because of its Anglican principles, and the plan miscarried. Gell became Headmaster of the Queen's School, Hobart, which carried on from the earlier Church school. Franklin handsomely subsidized Queen's School; Eardley-Wilmot did not. One reason for his refusal was the extreme shortage of funds, but he made clear his preference for a school of broader doctrinal inspiration.⁶⁰ Queen's died soon after. In 1846, however, Nixon revived the old scheme and established Christ College; Gell became Warden; and 'feeders' developed in the Launceston Grammar School and Hutchins School, Hobart.

The model for Anglican secondary education in New South Wales was not Rugby but the 'King's Schools', one of which Broughton had attended at Canterbury. As Archdeacon he founded one counterpart at Sydney, which soon failed, and another at Parramatta, which effectually set about its work of training 'about 100 boys, of the best families in the country'.⁶¹ The St James Grammar School was founded under episcopal auspices in Sydney in 1843 and later affiliated with the Anglican seminary, which provided some tertiary education for non-divinity students also. The Bishops' conference looked forward to establishing a Church college in conjunction with the proposed University of Sydney. Meanwhile, however, the secular character of the University so offended the Church of England that alone of the major denominations it had no representation in the first Senate. By this time the precursor of Melbourne Grammar School had been founded by Perry and R. H. Budd, another old boy of Arnold's.

Despite many difficulties and setbacks, the Church had displayed its customary vigour in providing for the education of those young men most likely to further its ideals. Broughton and his fellows had already shown, and realized, that their ideals ran counter to the mainstream of Australian history. Yet they did not falter in resisting the current, however fiercely it might swirl against them. No group stated its philosophy so clearly or held to it so firmly as did the Church of England. For these reasons, if no other, it achieves in retrospect near-heroic stature.

The Sydney Morning Herald

Secular thought offered no true counterpart to the Anglicans' social theory. They founded their creed on the premise that, however environments might differ, the Church remained the repository of divine truth.

On what rock could other conservatives build their temple? No age-glorified interests or hallowed institutions lay to hand; the political, social, and economic realities of colonial life were forever changing. When Europe itself felt the impact of new forces and ideas, the search for stable elements in Australia became yet more tortuous. Consequently, the many magazines and newspapers published throughout the colonies offered little doctrine that can properly be labelled 'conservative'. Of this little, the *Sydney Herald* (founded 1831) supplied by far the greater part.⁶² By 1835 the journal was already challenger for hegemony of the colonial press, and fifteen years later held it firmly. Its price went steadily downward, its regularity of publication upward, its circulation and financial stability onward. One caesura broke this progress: a change of ownership in February 1841. Both before and after that date the paper was broadly 'conservative', but in so different a temper that the two periods require separate attention.

The conventions of the day demanded that every editor renounce sectional favouritism or interest. From its birth the *Herald* bore two mottoes from Pope:

In Moderation placing all my Glory,
While Tories call me Whig—and Whigs a Tory.

and

Sworn to no Master, of no Sect am I.

They were probably chosen by the Presbyterian cleric, John McGarvie, the most constant leader-writer of early years. In fact, he was far more conservative than these bland words suggested, and so too were the men who owned the paper from 1835 to 1841, Ward Stephens and F. M. Stokes. Never was the *Herald* so firmly opposed to radical ideas as in that period.

Quite often, indeed, 'Tory' and 'Whig' became synonyms for 'good' and 'bad'. A 'Botany Bay Tory' was described in 1837 as 'a respectable person who has emigrated to this Colony, and who brings with him the virtuous principles which he has had instilled into him in his native land'. This ideal type would hold land either purchased or granted, and would be a substantial agriculturalist; even the woolgrowers of the far interior were 'working bees', in contrast to the landlord drones of Sydney. 'Emigrant Colonists' were the proper instigators of constitutional reform since they had a standing independent of the local government. Rebuking Bourke for not holding a ball to celebrate the King's Birthday in 1837, the *Herald* asserted that 'the respectable Colonists, with their wives and daughters, have a prescriptive right to assemble at Government-house on an occasion like this'. When such men clashed with the government, as was common in Bourke's latter years, the *Herald* was their stout supporter. The concept of a land fund for emigration was denigrated as a sectional, unjust tax on the property-owning class, while the editors' proposals for the administration of this money clearly indicate their

sympathies: the contributors to the fund should have the use of all migrants' labour and determine their selection as to age, sex, skills, etc.; numbers should come from England, Scotland, and Ireland in proportion to the nationality of landowners, and the law should compel all assisted migrants to become rural workers. The writer of these proposals had firmly grasped the significance of the migrant as a social force, and was determined that this power create an environment patterned on the old world.

The Stokes-Stephens *Herald* was happiest when attacking the enemies of its ideal type, foremost of whom were British Whigs, especially those who sympathized with Daniel O'Connell's Irish nationalism or who accepted the colonial theories of E. G. Wakefield. The latter's ideal was similar to the *Herald's*—a society of leisured gentlemen farmers—but he sought to achieve it by concentrating settlement through the imposition of a 'sufficient' selling price for land. The *Herald* maintained that the gentry should acquire their acres cheap. Wakefield was also depicted as the inspirer of 'the parcel of land jobbers' who formed the South Australian 'Bubble Company' and ever sought to discredit the older colonies. Justifiably, the Molesworth Committee appeared as a Wakefieldian tool, concerned only to harm New South Wales for the good of South Australia. A report that the Imperial government planned to sell colonial land in Britain evoked a similar protest. 'Yes, colonists, a plundering Whig ministry purposes, it is said, to seize the funds arising from the sale of *your* lands, and appropriate them in England.' Impositions on the colonial revenue, such as those for police expenses, a judge at Norfolk Island, and a residency in New Zealand, were all attributed to Whiggish greed rather than any inevitable divergence between metropolitan and colonial interests.

The local Whigs, especially Bourke and his supporters, suffered equal abuse. Bourke was certainly a determined, even ruthless, advocate of a policy founded upon the insistence that all citizens should be equal before the law, whatever their religion and whether or not they had once been convicts. He placed sympathizers and relatives in many important positions, the most notable instance being his replacement of the veteran Colonial Secretary, Alexander Macleay, with his own son-in-law, Edward Deas Thomson. At the end of 1835 Roger Therry—a Roman Catholic, government office-holder, editor of Canning's speeches, and a close friend of the Governor's—stood for election as Chairman of Quarter Sessions. Voters comprised all the Justices of the Peace in the colony, both the equivalents of English squires and the stipendiary magistrates through whom the colony was administered. The *Herald* violently supported C. D. Riddell, the Colonial Treasurer, a declared enemy of Bourke's policy. Riddell's victory was acclaimed and a ballot list published to show that Therry's supporters were nearly all dependent on the government. When Bourke dismissed several of the 'squire' justices some weeks later, the *Herald* protested in the name of 'every man who is not

disposed to become the slave of the O'Connell Tail faction, which at present afflicts this Colony'. The stipendiary magistrates were consistently presented as instruments of arbitrary despotism. Even the colony's judges came under suspicion as lackeys of government, threatening the liberty of country gentlemen. The liberals who banded together in the Australian Patriotic Association (1835) appeared to the editors as a 'motley crew of Jew pedlars, tailors, tinkers, and gentlemen in Parramatta jackets'; those colonists who attended a farewell meeting to Bourke, 'shoeless and shirtless rascals'. The pro-government newspaper, *Sydney Gazette*, commonly bore the label of 'Court and Convict Journal'.

This tag indicated the controversy that raged over the status of ex-convicts in the colony. Bourke had granted those who had either received an absolute pardon or served their full term the right of jury service, the most important constitutional privilege then available in the colony. This policy was fought bitterly by the *Herald*, which in an editorial of 23 February 1837 postulated a deep and permanent cleavage within society: 'the law *must* be altered, if our "liberal" rulers are not determined to hand over the sole administration of the law . . . to felons and their abettors! Let emigrants be tried by emigrants; and let transported persons be tried by paid commissioners.' Many other articles dealt with this subject: 'The respectable Emancipist', ran one illuminating sentence, 'is modest and retiring; and in proportion as he is so, so is he respected.'

Many who feared lest the evil of transportation might dominate the colony felt the need for severe convict discipline. Declaring itself in support of Judge Burton, the most lucid exponent of this argument, the *Herald* maintained:

there is a necessity for some nervous vigorous arm to wield the sword of justice, and to tighten the reins of that insolent domineering faction, which from late specimens of its morality, would level the boundaries of morals, and plunge every *honest* institution into confusion.

Examples of convict insubordination and crime always received full, highly-coloured reporting. The ultra-liberal penology of Alexander Maconochie at Norfolk Island drove the editors nearly to hysteria. They compared negro slaves and transportees, and concluded that the latter were entitled to far less 'natural and social liberty', since their condition derived from no accident of birth but from self-willed transgression.

Worthless characters were prevalent amongst the migrants too, 'and, had we the power, we would exclude them from the jury-box just as we would the others'. Thus free workingmen received treatment hardly less scathing than that accorded the convict. Hints of working-class political activity were deplored, though with the assurance that material conditions in Australia were too comfortable to foster trade unions and demagogic Chartists. Roman Catholics and southern Irish similarly

offended the *Herald*, which declared them 'ignorant, turbulent, mentally debased, and totally unqualified for the elective franchise'. The Papists were alleged to be planning ascendancy over the 'respectable Protestant Emigrant Colonists' by flooding the country with immigrants of their faith.

The small, near-peasant farmer suffered similarly. Bourke's system of allocating assigned labour was deplored because it benefited these men—'precisely the parties who ought to be discouraged from having Convicts [since] . . . their intercourse is of the most familiar discription'. When the government assisted the settlement of a group of smallholders, the *Herald* protested against such 'monstrous abuse' of the land fund—creating competition for labour rather than supplying the gentleman farmer with that essential commodity. Aborigines, too, were detested as obstacles in the hero's path. One of the distinguishing features of the colonial Whig, according to the *Herald's* definition, was to be 'maudlin about the "poor blacks"'. A sneer and a snarl were ever-ready to introduce story upon story of native treachery and barbarism. The moral argument against European intrusion was swept aside:

it is the right of civilized men to occupy countries in a state of nature, the inhabitants of which merely roam over the soil, without any defined form of government; because, if this were not so, the great end of civilization could never be effected.

Gipps's execution of seven white men after the notorious Myall Creek massacre was described as 'judicial murder' and the great blot in the early months of his government.

Even in its most Tory period, however, the *Herald* did not always side with reaction. It believed in constitutional reform, if only to strengthen the hands of the gentry; in general, even compulsory, education, provided that the respectability did not have to pay for the education of convicts' children; in the Church Act, if not in multi-establishment in any further sense; in the desirability of erasing the convict stain, if not in the immediate recommendations of the Molesworth Committee. This positive note sounded with increasing strength during 1840. Postal reform was urged; meteorological data were published, as part of the 'Advancement of Science'; the formation of an agricultural society was hailed enthusiastically.

There were several causes for this change of attitude: Bourke's departure, the end of assignment, and the imminence of free institutions all served to render the old-style Toryism obsolete. Doubtless some individuals continued to argue as the *Herald* had during the thirties, but no journal could do so and survive. The new emphasis had another, more direct, cause: the association of Charles Kemp, John Fairfax, and Ralph Mansfield with the journal, which culminated in early 1841 in its sale to Kemp and Fairfax. With Mansfield's literary assistance, they guided the paper on its new path.

All three leaders were notable men. John Fairfax had arrived in Sydney in 1838, and immediately before coming to the *Herald* had had charge of the Australian Library. He was an active Congregationalist, a trained compositor, and splendid man of business. Kemp had migrated early in life, and by 1841 was an experienced newspaper editor. His interests were many-sided: he was prominent in the Church of England and in the Sydney Mechanics' Institute, in moves towards establishing railways in the colony, and in political life. Ralph Mansfield had come to New South Wales as a Wesleyan minister working under the Wesleyan Missionary Committee. Long before 1841 he had forsaken this connexion (although not his religious zeal) in favour of journalism, business enterprise, and public affairs. He had applied for the secretaryship of the Patriotic Association, and played an important part on a Protestant committee which defeated Bourke's education scheme. His only substantial publications, surveys of the censuses of 1841 and 1846, suggest that he could have achieved distinction as a social historian. In 1842 it was expressly denied that Mansfield determined editorial policy, but from Governor Gipps downward everyone supposed his the dominant figure behind the *Herald* of the forties.

The new editors drew their inspiration from the political economy of Adam Smith and his school. The slogans from Pope more closely represented the paper's real temper and creed than ever before. "THE PEOPLE" of New South Wales', ran one typical declaration, 'consist of the whole body of its free Colonists, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest.' Henceforth editorial policy condemned violent or class-inspired behaviour, no matter whose. Thus the new *Herald*, like the old, was at its most effective when criticizing the transgressions of some interest.

It was very anxious lest government become over-active. Save for one brief period of equivocation, attempts to establish a Usury law were firmly reprov'd; rarely was the editorial tone more jubilant than when bankers themselves took the initiative in restoring the interest rate to a moderate level. Replying to an advocate for a fixed price for bread in August 1846, the editors admitted that if a monopoly *were* truly established then such a measure might be valid—

But for a season only, and only in such a manner as not to retard the desired and inevitable change which the advancement of the society, the abolition of privileges, the accumulation and attraction of capital, the perception of profits, would ere long occasion.

Likewise, the fifteen-hour day allegedly required of grocers' assistants was disagreeable but 'as for legislative interference, the idea is preposterous: nothing would justify it in the case of adults, who are quite able to take care of themselves'. The Party Processions Prevention Act (which sought to eliminate street rioting), a Bill intended to prevent the outflow to California of assisted migrants, and agitation for the pro-

hibition of local distilling of spirits, all threatened excessive interference with civil liberty. Denison's dismissal of Judge Algernon Montagu, after a dispute over the legitimacy of a local tax, grossly limited judicial independence. Neither Broughton's Sabbatarian proposals nor Perry's for the discipline and organization of his diocese were fit subjects for legislative action.

Laissez faire principles were applied to the ever-vexed problem of land. The editors saw the £1 per acre demand by the 1842 Act as denying the natural operation of the free market. Land did not produce sufficient wealth to command that price. Gipps's regulations of 1844, which sought to equate the £1 per acre idea with the reality of squatting, evoked fierce denunciation: 'folly . . . cruelty . . . despicable blunder . . . despotism'. Not only were the squatters expected to pay an unreal price, but the government threatened to exercise a power over them wholly inimical to the liberty of the subject. Through the shifts and changes of the subsequent years, the *Herald* clung more or less consistently to this point of view. The 1846 Act, although recognized as giving the squatter all he could hope for so long as Wakefieldian ideas prevailed at the Colonial Office, was criticized for still requiring that 'the relation between the Crown and the great bulk of our graziers be that of landlord and tenant—a relation as incompatible with the dignity and true functions of the monarch as with the freedom and energy of the subject'. Frequently the *Herald* urged that the colonial legislature take over the control of land and set about fixing a price which would encourage men to buy property and settle upon it.

Broughton's misgivings about squatting were not altogether absent from the editors' minds. It was they who described the system as a 'gigantic anomaly'. Even at the height of the 1844 crisis the pastoralists were implored to act 'as becomes gentlemen and British subjects' and Gipps's later proposals received a fair hearing. In March 1847 an anonymous reviewer wrote scathingly of the 'spirit of disaffection and defiance' of some of the big squatting companies. But the pastoralists' great crime in the *Herald's* eye was to advocate the resumption of transportation. The exile scheme had been favourably considered, but from 1846 onward antipathy to any relic of convictism became increasingly vehement. The society which the *Herald* wanted to develop must be created by free migration, which promised 'not only *numbers*, but pledges of *increase*, and not pledges of increase only, but pledges also of domestic happiness, of social consolidation, of moral improvement, of political growth'.

Even the more stable elements of colonial wealth sometimes incurred the *Herald's* displeasure. Efforts in 1841 to introduce a local Corn law which might strengthen the agricultural interest prompted most unconservative comment:

on this great national question, 'the wisdom of our ancestors' is but another term for the power and self-interest of the landed aristocracy

. . . to introduce this ancient tissue of blunders into a new country, is to sin against the light and knowledge of modern times.

The *Herald* rejoiced when Sir Robert Peel abandoned Protection and eulogized him on his death as 'the man of progress, in contradistinction from the man of change'. It again suspected that an unfair advantage was being sought when the lawyer-politician Richard Windeyer urged in 1843 that the government enliven the economy by advancing credit to the colonial landowners. The *Herald's* momentary support of a Usury law expressed its criticism of urban capitalists for raising interest rates, earlier in the depression.

Colonial politicians were sometimes found guilty of excessive hostility to the government. When, in October 1843, many elected members of the Council criticized the financial Estimates, the *Herald* warned against carrying the attack too far. In particular, several editorials deprecated any cuts in the money set aside for the judiciary—an institution of unique importance. If the councillors thus immoderately applied 'the despicable spirit of a Joseph Hume, double distilled', the Imperial government would lose all faith in the colony's institutions. In the next year's session the *Herald* was offended by the councillors' refusal to co-operate with the government in giving life to district councils provided for by the 1842 Constitution. The editors judged that the Governor was but slightly more responsible than the Council for the many bitter clashes of 1844. Port Phillip separationists underwent a still heavier barrage. Their campaign was radical, O'Connellite; the mock-election of Earl Grey as member for Melbourne (a stratagem to highlight the movement), the work of 'traitors to their country'.

Those who professed to lead left-wing political activity likewise threatened communal unity and co-operation.

To instil into the minds of what are called the working men [exposulated one editorial in March 1844] a feeling of class separation, or of class independency, or of class antagonism and rivalry, towards the classes from which alone they can obtain employment, and with whose welfare their own is necessarily interwoven, is . . . a cruel wrong to society at all times.

Politics were as great an evil as intoxicating liquor for such people; their aims were often marked by the same selfishness which inspired Corn laws and other restriction on trade. A quasi-Chartist address published in 1848 was dismissed as 'this precious morsel of rant'.

At such moments the *Herald* of the forties came very close to the tone of the Stokes-Stephens era. The parallel continued quite far. 'Larger holdings, by requiring assisted and divided employments, and united and co-operative labour, tend to produce and diffuse wealth among all ranks of a community'—this was an intellectual re-statement in 1841 of the earlier admiration for the gentleman farmer, especially as against the smallholder. For all the emphasis on personal liberty, the new editors

never protested against Master and Servant legislation. Maconochie had been abused in the past; now support for the abolition of capital punishment was depicted as 'a diseased sympathy towards atrocious criminals'. Despite high-sounding repudiation of the emancipist-freeman division—'the great plague spot of our society, the one great blot upon our happiness'—editorials deplored the appearance of ex-convicts on the hustings or at Government House.

The *Herald's* attitude to constitutional issues re-emphasized its essential conservatism. It urged the establishment of a bicameral legislature wherein the upper House would mediate between 'the *movement* spirit of the people', and 'the *conservative* spirit of the Government'. The lower House would express the 'movement spirit' and check the executive primarily by its power over finance. The editors, however, professed not to know the meaning of 'responsible government', as that term was used (virtually in the modern sense) by W. C. Wentworth and other colonial politicians. If it implied that executive officers could be dismissed at the legislature's will, then the glorious concept of monarchy was overthrown. Nor did it accept Wentworth's argument that the 1842 Constitution put the government of the colony into local hands, where it had always by right belonged:

The colonial estate has all along been in the hands of its rightful signiors, the British Empire; it has all along been managed by competent agencies, the agencies constituted and appointed by that empire; and the present agency can have no right to question the powers of its predecessors, since those powers flowed from the same authority as its own.

As the decade progressed the *Herald* became less wholehearted in its admiration for Imperial power, yet still looked upon the Governor's role as comparable with that of a Prime Minister, with executive powers almost independent of the legislature. Any thought of separation from Britain was repudiated—nothing would be gained and 'the only effectual guarantee for the stability of our freedom' lost.

Like Broughton, the *Herald* considered a £20 franchise dangerously low. The Australian Colonies Government Act was coolly received, because of its even more liberal franchise provisions. The editors did not want legislators elected by the whole people; it wanted men who would sincerely *represent* the whole people. The trend towards closer identification of a Council member and his particular supporters therefore appeared dangerous.

Not surprisingly, Kemp, Fairfax, and Mansfield treated the interests of religion generously. Their journal was far more pro-Anglican than the sum of their own predilections—in this, it would seem, being conservative by some innate compulsion. It supported Broughton at such crucial moments as Polding's taking a territorial title and the Sconce-Makinson defection. Romanism and the Irish at large continued to be

the target of frequent attacks. The denominational system of education was espoused, for the sanctions of morality without religion were 'but a feeble barrier to the animal instincts and impetuous passions'. Robert Lowe, Broughton's traducer, came under frequent criticism. One instance followed his argument in the murder trial of John Knatchbull that the accused suffered from a psychological defect which denied the power of free will. If this view were accepted, argued the *Herald*, then the accepted principles of Christianity, government, and morality must all be overthrown.

On matters affecting economic development the journal was far from hidebound, but constantly preached the need for stability and settled industry. Even at the depths of the depression it refused to surrender to black pessimism, preferring to teach the lesson that speculation was always dangerous and should never recur on the scale of earlier years. The editors were proud that the idea of boiling down sheep for tallow, which helped ease the depression, was first aired in their columns. It was precisely the type of action, showing intelligent self-interest and diversifying the economy, that delighted them. Beet sugar, wine, silk, olive oil, and tobacco were all suggested as further buttresses of prosperity. Even small-scale agricultural settlement won some favour. Scientific discoveries and land exploration also promised general advantage: Ludwig Leichhardt was presented as a benefactor to 'commerce and civilisation, and all the permanent interests not only of the colonies, but of the whole future population of this continent'. Colonists were exhorted to display their manufactures at the Great Exhibition of 1851, the concept of which met with tremendous enthusiasm.

In a retrospect published on New Year's Day 1850 the *Herald* expressed satisfaction at the colony's progress, achieved as it had been 'without any of those extraordinary accidents to which some other countries are indebted for a mushroom precocity of growth. We owe nothing to gold-dust or precious stones.' Throughout the following year the editors were smugly critical of the excitement and dislocation caused by the Californian gold-rushes. No wonder then that the local discoveries of April-May 1851 were coldly received. 'It appears that this colony is to be cursed with a gold-digging mania', was the theme of much unhappy comment.

So re-appeared the journal's antipathy to events and influences which threatened to break conventional moulds. An English Tory may have found this sentiment somewhat strange in a disciple of Adam Smith, but the conditions of New South Wales would have made his own conservatism irrelevant, almost ludicrous. As it was, the *Herald* had to bear such epithets as 'dear, lacrymose, old Granny',⁶³ and greater reaction must have evoked proportionate ridicule. The proprietors of another newspaper once remarked of a rumour that Ward Stephens's estate was to resume the *Herald*, that this journal would then 'be sure to go headlong into the ranks of the Tory party—ours will then be the task to preserve

the *balance of the constitution*—to prevent the encroachment of either party on the liberties of the people'.⁶⁴ The implied compliments were thoroughly deserved. The *Herald* appealed to an intelligent, disinterested *élite* against the ravages of greed and mobocracy. It trusted that this class could be found, and that under its guidance the colony might become an Elysium of solid prosperity. God would reign in heaven, and on earth men would fulfil the duties of their respective stations in happy co-operation.

* * *

The other newspaper mentioned was the *Australian*, which after various changes of ownership had been taken over by Messrs Statham and Forster, backed by James Macarthur. Under this management strenuous efforts were made to rebuild the paper as a powerful influence, although on a basis different from the ardent liberalism with which it had campaigned against Bourke's predecessor, Sir Ralph Darling. Yet it never became more than a shadow of the *Herald*, pursuing broadly similar policies without the same conviction and depth. The partnership of Statham and Forster with Macarthur collapsed, and the *Australian* staggered to its death (1848) as the organ of arch-squatter Benjamin Boyd.

The Tasmanian press had one great, prospective, connexion with the *Herald*: the Launceston *Examiner* often carried leaders by the Congregational minister John West, who in 1854 became editor of the Sydney journal. Tied to urban business interests, the *Examiner* interpreted *laissez faire* in more radical fashion than did the *Herald*: it proclaimed Richard Cobden, not Peel, as 'the man of the age'.⁶⁵ The island's major conservative voice was the *Hobart Town Courier*, which in February 1846 declared its 'leading principle' to be 'repudiation of factions, and a tone of consistent moderation'. The *Courier* gave much fairer hearings than did most contemporaries to the successive governors of the island. In 1835, it was attacking the demand for self-government of an early political association; in 1850, forecasting that the Australian Colonies Government Act would herald, not independence, but local sovereignty within the Imperial framework. The right to vote, its editor wrote in 1850, should depend on intelligence, length of colonial residence, and 'social responsibility'. Sensitive to the threat in colonial life of 'independence of mind breaking down every barrier of religion, or treating it as world worship', the *Courier* in June 1848 advocated sympathy for all denominations, although itself preferring the Church of England. This journal was so partial to the large farmer that it supported the legal restriction of both interest and wage rates. It was hostile towards 'mephitic, demoralising, wicked, slanderous' journals which sought to inflame the popular mind.

Colonial magazines were even less inclined to conservatism than were the newspapers. A partial exception was the *Australian Felix Monthly Magazine*, published in Geelong. In lauding the ties which bound the

colony to Britain one contributor attacked his enemies in thoroughgoing Tory style:

if we reject these instincts which sway the mind, whether or no, and pull down and build up according to the manner of our own puny intellects—we are gainsaying the institution of both God and man—and degrading to the level of mere human reason, a system of things, which, though not opposed to it, is above and beyond it. If, then, in Port Phillip society has been shorn of much which ornaments it at home, and if we are reduced to a more humble style of social architecture—let us not throw away the few graces we have left, and turn a British settlement into a Yankee republic . . . Let us remember, that it was in colonial independence that the torch which has consumed half Europe was first lighted.⁶⁶

Perhaps it was the same writer who slated 'The Progress of Democracy'⁶⁷ throughout the world. As against Rousseau's belief in the perfectibility of human beings, he posited their fallen and dependent nature and so common man's incapacity for self-government.

The same themes were taken up by the *Politician*, launched in April 1851 by a group of Australian natives. Throughout its brief existence this little magazine argued for conservative principles with unique fidelity and determination. The richest superlatives avowed the editors' loyalty to Britain, in order to demonstrate how mistakenly their compatriots' opinions 'have been perverted and put forth by democratic agitators'. Consciously defying the blatant optimism of time and place, one article referred to 'this insignificant colony'; another attacked all working-class political action as a subversive manoeuvre to secure monopoly over the labour market.⁶⁸ Probably the young G. W. Rusden wrote 'On the True Principle of Representation, as Applied to Colonies'.⁶⁹ His answer was not population, nor even population and property, but 'productive industry'; in practice this meant that Sydney must not swamp the pastoral interest.

Demonstrably, then, some able and intelligent men throughout the colonies wanted society to be guided by traditional beliefs concerning class, creed, and politics. Nor did Broughton and the *Herald* simply represent ideas, as distinct from political force. Yet more substantial interests backed conservatism.

CONSERVATIVE POWER

The Gentry

THE HISTORY of the Australian gentry has rarely attracted notice. Only Samuel Bennett's little-read *History of Australian Discovery and Colonisation* attempts to measure its significance. He saw the landowners' effort to mould Australia as an inspiring episode:

the pride of race—the consciousness of high social standing—the sentiment of family antiquity—however absurd when carried to excess, are capable of exercising, if kept under proper control, a very restraining and refining influence upon individual character (p. 629).

Bennett's care to qualify his admiration, the implied warning against romanticism, should not be forgotten. Some of the gentry were stupid and irresponsible, with all the anti-social attributes that arise from selfishness, greed, and arrogance. Yet men who conformed to Bigge's ideal were the squires' representatives, both in the councils and public meetings of the time and before the judgment of posterity.

By the standards of Australian geography, the gentry were closely concentrated. In New South Wales the limit was within the counties, in which alone land could be possessed in freehold. There was a steady progression of estates south and west from the capital, centred around Camden, Campbelltown, Goulburn, and Bathurst. Many settlers sought out the river valleys, especially those of the Fish, the Macquarie, and above all the Hunter. Other important districts were around Queanbeyan in the south and on the New England tablelands. The Tasmanian gentry scattered throughout the swathe running diagonally between the central-north and central-east coasts, Launceston and Hobart being the pivots. In the senior colony, the number of estates might have reached 400; in the junior, 250.

The backgrounds of the gentry varied widely. The oldest-established could trace their colonial roots to the first twenty years of Australian history—to the officers of the military establishment (Macarthur, Fenn Kemp, Lawson, Piper), or the civil establishment (Wentworth, Palmer, Jamison); to non-commissioned ranks of the New South Wales Corps (Faithfull, Bradley); to the few dozen free settlers sent out while the foundation ideal of peasant proprietorship retained some force (Rouse, Bowman of Archerfield, Badgery); even to the convict ranks (the Lords,

Pye, Reibey, Dry). The Campbells of Duntroon, William Campbell of Harrington Park, Alexander Berry, and John Grono all became landed proprietors in New South Wales after pioneering commerce based on Sydney. As early as 1805, the British government had encouraged settlers of larger means and prestige to migrate. The outstanding survival from this era was the Blaxland family. The *Australian* mourned John Blaxland in 1846 as 'a type of the English Country Gentleman. In his mind and even in his features, he was emphatically Saxon'—an obituary that would have given its subject deep pleasure.

These were the men whom James Mudie, a witness before the Molesworth Committee, described as 'the ancient nobility'.¹ That adjective was the key word: indeed it often became the noun used to distinguish the pioneer gentry. Blaxland himself had been classed as 'one of the ancients'.² Governor Bourke wrote to the Colonial Office in 1837 regretting the death of 'Mr. Archibald Bell, an ancient and estimable Colonist';³ a left-wing newspaper referred to Alexander Berry with half-reverence, as 'The Ancient Nominee'.⁴ The use of the word reflected the role of this class in mitigating the crudity of colonial life.

The 'ancient' nucleus expanded in the twenties and thirties as the Colonial Office sought to implement Bigge's plan, which itself owed much to the greatest squire of all, John Macarthur. R. W. Hay at the Colonial Office, Alexander Macleay as Colonial Secretary, T. H. Scott as Archdeacon, Sir Thomas Brisbane (Governor 1821-5) and Ralph Darling in New South Wales, and George Arthur in Tasmania all upheld the concept of a powerful gentry, settled on extensive acres granted them by the Crown and made productive by the labour of Britain's criminals. The nature of the new immigrants was stated, directly and by implication, in a resolution sponsored by the non-official members of the New South Wales legislature in 1838:

that, in the opinion of this Council, the numerous Free Emigrants of character and capital, including many officers of the Army and Navy, and East India Company's Service, who have settled in the Colony, with their families, together with a rising generation of Native-born Subjects, constitute a body of Colonists, who, in the exercise of the social and moral relations of life, are not inferior to the Inhabitants of any other Dependency of the British Crown, and are sufficient to impress a character of respectability upon the Colony at large.⁵

Name after name in Mowle's *Genealogical History of Pioneer Families of Australia* fits the pattern thus suggested—Baylis, Blomfield, Boydell, Close, Gibson, Rodd, Steel, Waldron, and so on. Distinguished lineages were not common, but many had learned some idea of leadership in their service careers. This background was stressed by one commentator who had spent some years among the Tasmanian gentry. Such men, he said, 'felt it a duty incumbent on them to exert a control over their own actions and conduct, and maintain an elevated tone of

manner'.⁶ Perhaps this trait was stronger among men of the twenties than among the ancients.

That these settlers could not aspire to the heights of British society encouraged them to put down roots into Australian soil. This readiness was apparent in the homes they built. Just as the Macarthurs were the gentry prototype, so their residence, Camden Park, stood out from its peers. Designed by John Verge, the architecture remains impressive to this day. Much of its furniture dated from James Macarthur's European tour of 1836-7, on which, too, he found an English bride. Among his purchases were abundant saddlery and harness; glass and china; prints of the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Eldon, the first Earl Grey, and Sir Walter Scott. One merchant in Regent Street provided eighteen French-polished mahogany dining chairs, ninety-nine yards of first quality Brussels carpet, and a 'pair of rich crimson silk and worsted bell ropes with tassels and rosettes'.⁷

Australia's foremost poetess, Judith Wright, has imaginatively described Dalwood, the Hunter Valley home of her progenitors:

a great house of cool stone corridors and high-ceilinged rooms, of wide iron-barred doors opening on a stone flagged courtyard where servants pumped water splashing into pails; down the passages and through the windows wandered scents from Grandmamma's garden—summer roses, lemon-hedge, lavender and sage and queer herbs for *tisanes* . . .⁸

George Wyndham, the owner of Dalwood, had spent some £6,000 on his property, and came under Bourke's consideration as a likely nominee to the Legislative Council. As the Macarthurs were to the ancients, so he was to the new gentry. The names and the known history of many other estates carried the same suggestion of leisured cultivation: Piper's 'Alloway Bank', Wentworth's 'Windermere', Thomas Walker's 'Yaralla' in New South Wales; Fenn Kemp's 'Mount Vernon', Dry's 'Quamby', Lord's 'Quorn Hall' in Tasmania. Even less grand structures were impressive. Of George Bowman's relatively small establishment a young Scotsman wrote 'in all my subsequent travels I have never seen anything more calculated to convey the idea of home, of simple natural domestic life, and of family associations'.⁹

Very often, the stables were a noble appendage to the estate, for as with English squires and Southern planters, the horse was dear to the Australian gentry. This appeared clearly in the *New South Wales* (later *Australasian*) *Sporting Magazine*, edited by D. C. F. Scott, one of their number. It praised Jorrock's, an early hero of the racecourse; detailed the history of the thoroughbred in New South Wales; reviewed news of turf and hunt. Other articles treated fishing, woorang shooting, and 'Wild Cattle Hunting in the Blue Mountains'. Although irrigation, defence, and even the fine arts also received the editor's attention, the tang was of saddlery and horse-flesh. The Scotts of Glendon, the

Rouses of Windsor, and the Kearneys of Richmond, Tasmania, devoted particular care to breeding horses, hunting, and racing. William Kearney earned the sobriquet of 'Squire', evidently through his devotion to the hunt. From his estate, Laburnum Park, the Richmond Club would set out on the chase, to return to open-handed hospitality.

The horse gave the settlers not only personal pleasure, but also a common bond. They came together in hunt and jockey clubs, on occasion organizing a tourney of events topped by a grand ball that would have pleased the heart of Walter Scott. A marriage between two Tasmanian families was celebrated at Quorn Hall, by a chase after, not kangaroos or dingoes, but stags! The house-party went on for days, pigeon-shooting and cricket filling the men's spare daytime hours, while at night 'the votaries of Terpsichore and Calliope' had free rein.¹⁰

More formal though perhaps not more important ties further bound the gentry. The Australian Club in Sydney and the Union Club in Hobart were their citadels. The former, founded in 1838, had an upper membership limit (first 200, then 300); election was by ballot, and one black ball in ten would exclude a candidate. 'All the aristocracy of the country are in it', wrote Stuart Alexander Donaldson, chief organizer of the institution. The Australian Library was the cultural equivalent of the Club, and had similar powers of exclusion. In some country towns—Yass and Bothwell, for example—smaller libraries or literary societies catered for the same class.

The Hunter River settlers planned an ambitious society, whose objectives included a circulating library and public lectures as well as agricultural shows and festivals.¹¹ The first two aims had to be abandoned, but the others were effectively pursued there and elsewhere. On such occasions the gentry often presented awards to employees for long service and skill in agriculture. A group of squires might organize a ploughing match, attended by the locals who would afterwards disport themselves in Merrie England style.¹²

Two Tasmanian organizations—the Midland Agricultural Association and the Northern Agricultural Association—belonged to, yet transcended, this category. They went beyond discussion of farm science and holding of shows to become quasi-political organizations. 'I designate the land and agricultural interests the principal wheel in this complicated piece of machinery', argued the chairman of the Midland Association, when describing the colony's political economy to John Franklin, 'it sets all the others in motion, and it cannot clog without causing a general stagnation.'¹³ This Association openly repudiated Eardley-Wilmot, its patron, in the darkest days of his government;¹⁴ Denison came close to receiving a similar snub, and took it as a heartening sign when the danger passed away.¹⁵ During the mid-thirties, both colonies produced regional associations 'for the Suppression of Felonies and Misdemeanors'. More bluntly, they were posesses to curb stock-stealing. The development emphasized the gentry's readiness to

see themselves as arbiters of the community: to make and enforce the laws. The point became clear in the next decade when Eardley-Wilmot rejected the Midlanders' plan to form a yeomanry to combat bushranging. Levying of armed troops, he insisted, was a prerogative of the Crown.¹⁶

The gentry expressed their cohesion and leadership on many public occasions. They dominated meetings which welcomed or farewelled local dignitaries—the police magistrate, the parson, the Governor on tour. They addressed the monarch on royal death, accession, marriage, and parenthood. Public meetings, discussing anything from major political issues to the foundation of a local hospital or mechanics' institute, normally came under the same aegis.

Many of the gentry were active in church affairs. The Church of England gained the support of most, and a number built churches and chapels or otherwise endowed Anglican funds. George Cox's avowal of faith in the Church of England—it embodied 'a Religion our Queen and Country profess and therefore believe to be right'¹⁷—was appropriate to his class. The shallowness of the remark suggests why Broughton had finally to admit tradesmen to his lay councils. James Macarthur's refusal to protest against the Church Act, followed by his alliance with the Roman Catholic Roger Therry in the 1843 election, emphasized that even the staunchest gentry might not grant unqualified support to the Church of England. A few owed allegiance to other faiths: the Tasmanian Russells to Presbyterianism, James Bowman to the Free Church, the O'Briens of Yass to Roman Catholicism, and so on. The squire and parson were linked together in Australia, but less closely than in Britain.

The intermingling of the gentry permeated their personal life. The Anglican schools catered for the children of such men. Some Hunter River settlers used characteristic terms when planning (vainly) an 'Academy or College . . . conducted in a manner calculated to impart not merely scholastic knowledge; but, also that gentlemanly tone and bearing which are difficult of acquirement in a Colony so peculiarly situated as this'.¹⁸ The *élite* of the gentry—its James Macarthurs—were able to go to England to find their brides, but the majority had to choose from local families of equal rank. Many such alliances took place, and their progeny have contributed much to Australian culture. David Scott Mitchell, his name combining those of two Hunter families, was the man whose collection of Australiana founded one of the world's great libraries, while Judith Wright, Patrick White, and Russell Drysdale are among the gentry's descendants.

The gentry dominated 'society'. The sensitivity of the *Herald* to the rights of gentlemen typified much feeling for which Government House was the focus. 'Being, or not being, admitted here is, in this place, considered as the great criterion of a person's social position',¹⁹ wrote Lady Denison, whose letters and journals frequently emphasized the

significance attached to invitations to her husband's entertainments and to the granting of precedence. A complement of this feeling impressed G. F. Davidson, an erstwhile merchant-trader who settled on the Paterson River:

to obtain admission to good society in Sydney when my family first arrived there, was no easy matter. Not that there was any lack of it in the place, but the residents were, very properly, shy of strangers, unless provided with testimonials as to their respectability.²⁰

That ubiquitous word! Yet not meaningless; the concept of respectability did much to hold the squires together.

Emphasis on their unity requires qualification, however. This social hauteur pleased Davidson, but it angered others, including embryogentry who found themselves ostracized. When James Mudie spoke of 'the ancient nobility' it was not in awe, but in sarcastic envy. Mudie's odd, pretentious character partly explained his position; but other evidence shows that as each batch of landholders became settled, they looked with jealousy on those who followed.²¹ The reason was simple: the more numerous the gentry, the greater the competition for government bounty of land and labour.

The colonies' peculiar history provided further reason for division. Men remembered who was the son of an officer, who of convicts. Such sensitivity prevailed especially among the ancients, while the immigrant of the twenties had reason to look upon that whole group with some contempt.

The free colonists who came out in Sir Thomas Brisbane's time, [were] men of station and education [later declared one of their sympathizers] but an early Gazette showed the tracts opened through their enterprise granted to the sons and daughters of officials, to pliant secretaries, to grog-selling captains, and to conveniently perjuring officers of police.²²

This approached hyperbole; nonetheless, the patriarchs of the two colonies, John Macarthur and Anthony Fenn Kemp, had led the mutiny against Governor Bligh in 1808.

Nor was there absolute conformity in politics. W. C. Wentworth, to take the outstanding example, often behaved in typical gentry fashion both in his social relations (he sent his son off to Trinity, Cambridge, bidding him uphold the 'honor of your family & your country')²³ and in his politics; yet he was also the spokesman of other interests. This diversity sprang in part from Wentworth's background, but also from his appetite for intellectual adventure. Sir John Jamison and even Blaxland were others who adopted ideas at variance with their peers.

The Gentry and Constitutional Structure

The gentry believed themselves the natural leaders of society. This principle they sought to impress on the legal and political institutions

of their adopted country. Although the Governors varied in their estimates of the gentry, all to some extent recognized their claim to particular respect. Accordingly, most non-official nominees to the Legislative Councils of both colonies were gentry. Towards mid-century the number of exceptions increased, but not enough to distort the general picture. Again, when Gipps appointed the original district councils, the list read like a roll of the local landholders, with the most eminent carefully chosen as wardens. The same Governor warmly supported the idea that the Imperial government create an Order which might reward distinguished colonists. His list of suggested recipients comprised the leading government servants, civil and military, and also James Macarthur, P. P. King (son of an early Governor, and himself a distinguished naval officer), Robert Campbell, William Macarthur ('brother of Mr. James Macarthur above named, and with him joint proprietor of large estates'), Thomas Icely, Edward Hamilton, Francis Rossi, and Helenus Scott ('A settler on the River Hunter, Warden of the District Council of Patrick's Plains, and the eldest of several Brothers, sons of one of the oldest Settlers').²⁴ These were the Lords of Australia.

Of more immediate importance even than their place in the councils was the squires' role as Justices of the Peace. Thereby, they could exercise a very powerful influence over the administration of justice, especially outside the metropolis. Every local bench could, and probably at most sittings did, comprise a majority of non-stipendiary magistrates, with economic interests in common and often linked by marriage or friendship. Class law prevailed.

This was particularly, almost incredibly, true on the larger estates. Thus Alexander Berry ordered the local constable to maintain decorum in and around his establishment at Shoalhaven:

you are hereby requested to bring charges against Mr Hyams the Publican for a Breach of the Licensing regulations—and amongst other things for keeping John Watts the Cooper for a whole week in his house in a state of drunkenness and intoxication—and for coming upon this establishment & endeavouring to entice James Murray one of the Shepherds from his duty to go to his house as there was to be some fine Sport—you are also to bring charges against—Wells & Knight the Sawyers near the Ferry for Selling Spirits without a Licence.²⁵

The same attitude recurred throughout the evidence given to a New South Wales Legislative Council Committee which in 1835 enquired into the condition of the police.²⁶ T. A. Murray deposed that, although a member of the Goulburn bench, he rarely attended there, 'as I hold police courts at my own residence . . . where a constable and scourger are stationed'. The court met within Murray's home, and, as on many estates, a private lock-up was alongside.

The influence of these dignitaries could go well beyond their immediate jurisdiction. A major theme of Bourke's government was his attempt

to strengthen the executive *vis-à-vis* the amateur Justice. This was the setting for the famous Brisbane Water cases, when the government moved against Messrs Donnison, Bean, and Moore for allegedly stealing cattle from a ticket-of-leave man. Donnison published a long account of these proceedings, suffused with indignation that he, a Justice of the Peace, should be so treated. He depicted how, at the hearing before a stipendiary magistrate, he cross-examined a proletarian witness named Bramble:

the fellow crossed his arms, and with a knowing and familiar nod, said 'come now, Donnison, I tell you what it is, I never stole any thing from you.' Mr. Donnison said 'pray, Captain Faunce, do not allow that fellow to address me in such a manner.' Captain Faunce—'I can't help it, Sir, you are *only a common criminal*.' Mr. Donnison—'I have appealed to you as a Magistrate, Captain Faunce, I now appeal to you as a gentleman.' Captain Faunce (very mildly)—'Don't address Mr. Donnison in that way, Bramble.'²⁷

Perhaps the incident did not go precisely thus, but the tone of its relation was significant.

The gentry consistently strove to magnify their juristic power as against the government's. One illustration was the election of Riddell over Therry as Chairman of Quarter Sessions; another, the motion in 1838 by non-official legislators that the Court of Requests, of which Therry was Chairman, should be disbanded and its work left to the Justices.²⁸ This group also pressed for the establishment of a grand jury, which would take over from the Attorney-General the task of deciding whether particular criminal prosecutions should go forward.²⁹ Donnison had maintained that a grand jury would have quashed the proceedings against himself, and if—as might have been expected—his fellow-squires had been jurors, that was very likely. At the same time, some of the gentry campaigned against the abolition of military juries in criminal cases, a further liberal blow against class law.³⁰

The gentry's views on law, important though they were, merely implied their theory of politics and formed just one element in the struggle for power. Attitudes to broader constitutional issues also require study, despite the danger of attributing to the whole class the opinions of a few articulate spokesmen. New South Wales dominated the story, for early Tasmanian history fostered neither the careful statement of ideals nor the organization of dramatic campaigns. The vital point was the middle stage of Bourke's government. The so-called 'Hunter River clique'—the Scotts in the forefront—bitterly opposed every facet of Bourke's liberalism. James Mudie's book, *The Felonry of New South Wales*, embodied a crude form of this antipathy, as did the columns of the *Herald*. However, the gentry produced a few spokesmen—in particular, James Macarthur—who gave intellectual edge to their hostility. The expiry of the seven-year term originally prescribed for the

1828 Judicature Act sharpened the conflict. In the event the statute continued as long again; immediately, however, the various colonial interests had urgent reason to try to influence the British government. So now crystallized the otherwise amorphous clash between 'emancipists'—alias Australian liberals—and 'exclusives'—the gentry and their supporters. The exclusives' case was put in two petitions, addressed to the King and the House of Commons,³¹ and in Macarthur's book, *New South Wales; Its present state and future prospects*. This most interesting work was published in London in 1837, when its author was conducting an intense lobbying campaign.³²

Macarthur's introduction declared that 'the Petitioners look to the colony as their home, and the home of their children',³³ thus bringing to the fore one of the gentry's major strengths—their attachment to the new land and consequent determination to affect its destiny. These sentiments, the author continued, revolted at the use of the colony as a convict dump. He deplored Governor Lachlan Macquarie's policies which had tended to glorify convictism and to brand New South Wales with its stigma. In particular—and here Macarthur approached the core of the struggle—ex-convicts had come to think 'that the colony was *theirs by right*, and that the emigrant settlers were interlopers upon the soil'.³⁴

He urged a very different dynamic: in effect that such men as himself ought to guide the colony. Transportation should be examined with an eye to its replacement by extensive migration of a free proletariat. Ex-convicts should not possess civil rights as a matter of course or on a simple basis of wealth. In New South Wales the possession of property too often was unaccompanied by that sense of honour and obligation which ought to distinguish an *élite*. Instead, the franchise and the right to sit on juries should be allotted by the Justices of the Peace in each district. These Justices, or their social equals, should alone be eligible for the legislature—two-thirds elective, one-third nominated by the Crown, and so equipped as to hold the balance between the potential dangers of full self-government and the current situation in which the executive, not always sympathetic to the exclusives, held an impregnable position.³⁵ The petition to the King had already protested against the unchecked power of the government to order dismissals from the commission of the peace, as also from the judiciary.

The exclusive case appeared against a lurid backdrop of the crime and immorality of the colony. To some extent this emphasis aimed merely to denigrate Bourke's administration, especially the admission of ex-convicts to jury service. Yet the fear of anarchy was real. Sincerity rang through many pages of Macarthur's book and through such passages from the petitions as this:

Your petitioners are sensible that upon the measures, that may be now adopted for the Government of the Colony, depend their own best

interests, as well as those of their children. Property, life, reputation, moral and political well-being, whatever in short should be dear to men who have been taught to distinguish a rational and well-founded freedom from the disorganizing doctrines, which, under the name of liberty, would subvert the land-marks of social order, and, confounding all just distinctions, sap the foundations of society; all these are at stake.³⁶

The firmness of the exclusives' position soon softened, never to return. Too many events moved too fast. One was the cessation of transportation, which was abetted by the petitions and Macarthur's evidence to the Molesworth Committee but struck a heavy blow at gentry unity and prosperity. Similarly, the inflow of free migrants, which Macarthur had urged, created forces inimical to his ideal. The last issue on which anti-emancipist feeling rallied the gentry was a Bill of 1840 to establish a municipal corporation in Sydney.³⁷ Their protest against the grant of equal franchise to ex-convicts forced Gipps temporarily to withdraw the legislation. This was a victory for the exclusives, but early in the following year Macarthur signified that he wished to pursue the old quarrel no further.³⁸

An intelligent politician, Macarthur had decided that changing times necessitated changing policies. No doubt many of the gentry did not follow this line of thought, but in his behaviour over the years 1839-43—and nowhere else—lay an attempt to achieve political leadership on conservative principles. As a nominee member of the Council he opposed Imperial taxation. There was sound precedent for this. John Blaxland had pioneered the protests, which grew louder with every year, against colonial revenues being charged with police and gaol expenses, made heavy by the presence of Britain's convicts;³⁹ from 1838 to 1840 the non-official councillors vehemently fought an Ordnance Bill which proposed merely to reserve a few tracts of land for the use of the British Army but was interpreted as threatening an Imperial military despotism.⁴⁰ During the 1840 Council session Macarthur joined in denouncing police expenses and led opposition to a Public Works Bill, invoking 'the great principle of Whiggism' against taxation without representation.⁴¹ 'There were many with the spirit of Hampden in this colony' he asserted, very likely remembering the country-squire background of that rebel. In 1842 Macarthur came out against the revised Corporation Bill, not because it accepted ex-convicts but because yet further imposts would ensue.⁴²

So Macarthur upheld his promise of February 1841 that the emancipist-exclusive division should be forgotten. The occasion of his declaration was a meeting called to protest against Lord John Russell's legislation of 1840 which threatened 'dismemberment' of the colony. For various reasons this would have damaged the economic interests of Sydney and all established landholders, so a rough alliance now formed between Macarthur and Wentworth, previously identified with the liberal-

emancipist element. The next year both were active in the appointment of a committee to petition the Imperial authorities for colonial self-government. Macarthur accepted election to this body along with men he would have scorned a few years earlier. He did draw the line at Henry Macdermott, leader of a popular-radical element. 'They were to decide whether they would have their rights and privileges as Englishmen', said Macarthur, successfully blocking this candidature, 'or that vile democracy which has led to so much anarchy and confusion in different parts of the world'.⁴³ On the committee Macarthur pursued a line of moderate conservatism, holding out against a £10 franchise but not otherwise being 'exclusive'.

Naturally, he presented himself for election to the new Council. Wentworth spoke from his platform on nomination day, claiming that Macarthur had now accepted his own political views. The candidate himself admitted that in the past he might have been over-wary of change; now he 'stood there as the champion of constitutional freedom and rational liberty, in contradistinction to wild and perilous republicanism'.⁴⁴ Throughout the counties other gentry were securing election — T. A. Murray, William Bowman, John Coghill, John Pantony; and the Governor was to add still more as his nominees. Apparently the stage was set for Macarthur to become head of a solid phalanx that would strive to establish a more or less benevolent oligarchy.

This prospect failed when Macarthur was beaten at the polls, not to enter the Council until 1848. He had stood for Cumberland County against Cowper, having supported Roger Therry in his own electorate, Camden. This move was almost certainly part of a campaign to establish himself as true leader of the people, including Roman Catholics and moderate liberals. With equal likelihood, it was the cause of his defeat. Many of the settlers would not have been impressed by such breadth of mind.⁴⁵ Charles Cowper raised in opposition his Church-Tory programme; he and William Lawson were returned. Thus the conservative gentry went into the Council without their finest intellect. The dominant figures in the legislative proceedings of the next few years were Wentworth, Cowper, Lowe and Richard Windeyer. Although these men and the Council as a whole often supported gentry interests, no consistent statement of constitutional theory in the exclusive-Macarthur tradition developed.

Occasionally, however, the old spirit asserted itself, either in or outside the legislature. The institution of district councils provided one instance. The gentry and other members of the Council refused to listen to the government's plea that unless they relaxed the qualifications for membership, there would not be sufficient potential councillors throughout the colony.⁴⁶ In a subsequent debate Edward Hamilton, a non-official nominee and an extensive landowner at Cassilis, expressed his suspicion that these bodies would prove 'neither more nor less than schools of political agitation'.⁴⁷ Similarly Charles Campbell looked

askance at the councils for bringing 'to the very doors of quiet country folks . . . all the petty intrigues, strife, and heartburnings, attendant upon a popular election'.⁴⁸ The Australian Colonies Government Bill prompted further statements of this kind. The first draft postulated the establishment of local councils, which would in turn elect the central legislature. Conservatives found objectionable the low franchise projected for the preliminary elections,⁴⁹ while a meeting at Patrick's Plains claimed to express the sentiments of their fellow colonists thus:

as municipal bodies can only exist in their cities and towns, the rural, being the most useful and important part of the population of the colony, and comprising nearly half of the same, would be wholly unrepresented, and left in a situation unworthy of their descent and intolerable as British subjects to bear.⁵⁰

Inside the Council debate concentrated on whether the new legislature should have one chamber or two. The gentry members assented to the general feeling that the appointment of an upper house might result in an increase of the executive's power. Outside the Council, however, their peers joined in presenting a memorial which urged that it was 'of the highest importance to protect the colony against rash and hasty legislation by the interposition of a second chamber'.⁵¹ When the final draft came before Council in 1851, gentry legislators backed the successful move to redistribute electorates so as to give an overwhelming preponderance to the rural interest.

Some of the gentry, like the *Herald*, disapproved of the Council's extremism in attacking the local executive. Both William and James Macarthur expressed themselves to this effect when refusing invitations to stand for Camden after Roger Therry vacated the seat late in 1844. 'I consider the Council, as now constituted, to be no arena for men of moderate opinions, desirous of the public good, without selfish purposes of aggrandizement to promote, or private animosities to gratify', said William.⁵² His brother took the opportunity to call for a public protest against '*that shuffling evasive policy*' which had characterized the legislature's first two sessions. 'Anti-English' in nature, this behaviour did nothing to redress genuine grievances.⁵³ Specific issues on which James had already rebuked the legislature included district councils, which he thought should be given every encouragement,⁵⁴ and the report from a Council committee which attacked the Crown's land policy in 1844. Together with P. P. King, Francis Rossi, and other such men, he presented a memorial to Gipps on this occasion, expressing sympathy and remorse.⁵⁵ That Macarthur found this action necessary proved that many gentry in Council felt otherwise, but at least one legislator, Henry Dangar, declared his private regret at the violence of the anti-Gipps campaign.⁵⁶ He might not have been unique.

Despite his earlier protestations, William Macarthur did enter the Council in 1845. Soon after, he led a gentry splinter-group which sup-

ported the executive in defeating a motion for the publication of Gipps's correspondence concerning the appointment of Dowling's successor as Chief Justice. For this he was rebuked by the *Atlas* newspaper,⁵⁷ which insisted that knowledge of such matters was the rightful prerogative of the local assembly. The *Atlas*, guided by Robert Lowe, was at this time the chief mouthpiece of the extreme anti-government party. Perhaps a move to expel Lowe from the Australian Club reflected a growing revulsion against the tactics of this group.⁵⁸ Certainly the gentry at large rallied around Governor Charles FitzRoy when he was assailed by the anti-transportationists in 1849-50.⁵⁹

Tempered moderation did not distinguish the Tasmanian gentry's political behaviour. Indeed, the greater part of the island's constitutional history before mid-century centred on their virulent opposition to the various Lieutenant Governors. Led by T. G. Gregson, who was temperamentally closer to Wentworth than to Macarthur, they resorted to such tactics as a walk-out from the Council in 1846 in order to thwart Eardley-Wilmot's fiscal policies. This ardour reflected the conviction that the Imperial government had little business in the colony. Nevertheless F. R. Stieglitz probably spoke for many when he wrote, at a crucial moment of the Denison régime, 'I hope and trust for the good of the Colony and for peace and quietness and *to make us all more united* Sir William will become more popular.'⁶⁰ Presumably any insurgence from below would have met short shrift. In fact, circumstances forced no clear-cut statement on this issue; rather, the group who embarrassed Eardley-Wilmot won the sobriquet of 'Patriotic Six' and widespread admiration.

The Gentry and Social-Economic Structure

The gentry tried to shape society not only by participating in politics, but also through their role as economic men. Charles Campbell set the standard when he told a meeting of his peers at Queanbeyan that they should act 'as English gentlemen anxious to make this a second England'.⁶¹ It was not really paradoxical that these words came from an Australian native of Scottish stock. The more distant they were from the reality of England, the more fervently could the gentry vest it with romantic associations. 'England' meant an idyllic rural society, recollection of which evoked the ambition 'to exhibit, on a small scale, something like the beauties which rise at every step in the land to which we have bid adieu, well content if we can here and there produce a corn-field surrounded by a post and rail fence, or a meadow of English grasses clear of stumps.'⁶² The writer was a resident of Tasmania, which in this respect held considerable advantages over the senior colony. In climate and topography the island was 'degrees nearer home' for such anglophiles as Louisa Anne Meredith.⁶³

In this Merrie Australia the ownership of land attained vast significance.

T. A. Murray, no doubt glossing the facts, showed how the gentry liked to see themselves:

the great object which men, in general, have in view in emigrating to a new country, is to procure some portion of this earth as their own. That desire is so strong and so natural, that it is in itself sufficient to tempt men over half the circumference of the globe in search of a home. To make fortunes is not their object, but to ensure independence and comfort for their families.⁶⁴

Robert Scott once declared that he would buy land valueless to anyone else, simply to have his estate whole and rounded out.⁶⁵

On his land the ideal squire set out to develop a village community. Once again the Macarthur family provide the supreme example, making every effort to establish a prosperous and happy society on the Camden estate. Substantial cottages, a school, a benefit society, payment of up to a shilling a day for child labour, these were among the boons enjoyed by the Macarthur tenantry. The township of Camden still witnesses the potency of the English rural model, as do Scone, Cobbitty, Berrima, Stroud, and others in the New South Wales counties and Kempton, Bothwell, Oatlands, and Longford in Tasmania. Even the irascible Berry could soften with indulgent pride as he described Shoalhaven: 'altogether the establishment has grown up until it resembles a colony in miniature—about 200 people reside at the place amongst whom are Blacksmiths, carpenters, coopers, Tanners & Shoemakers—Brickmakers, Shipbuilders, etc.'⁶⁶ Andrew Lang, brother of the cleric-politician, was another Scot who became an Australian laird. Inevitably, Charles Campbell had much to say in praise of village communities.⁶⁷ He chided the settlers for not fostering them enough, but in the way of enthusiasts might have exaggerated evils he sought to remedy. The New South Wales gentry by and large agreed that leaseholders of land worth £20 annual rental should receive the vote.⁶⁸ Even if their motive was simply to gain a dependent vote, the reaction indicated that the development of a tenantry was quite general. This would seem also to have applied in Tasmania.⁶⁹

Associated with raising a tenantry was diversifying and intensifying the pastoral economy. Many of the gentry pushed beyond mere wool-growing: at Camden itself there were few sheep. William Macarthur was passionately interested in horticulture and communicated his knowledge to a wide circle of correspondents. He was, too, the author of a pamphlet on wine-growing, the pursuit of which became a distinguishing mark of the true-blue squire. George Suttor published a guide to the growing of oranges and grapes; C. E. Walthall one on tobacco,⁷⁰ a favourite crop throughout the Hunter Valley. The Scotts of Glendon experimented in the manufacture of gelatine and portable soup; George Harper of Abbotsford developed new varieties of grain; Hannibal Macarthur, Edward Lockyer, and John Blaxland sought to perfect the salt-preservation of meat. The Blaxlands also interested themselves in coal-mining and the

improvement of fodders; Thomas Icely bred sheep, horses, and cattle with impressive results. So the catalogue went on, culminating perhaps with Henry O'Brien's suggestion that the depression be mitigated by boiling sheep for tallow.

Yet with all this the explorer Strzlecki believed that 'in Van Diemen's Land, the agricultural districts are superior in appearance to those of New South Wales. The details of farms and farming are better understood and defined, and the practical results are such, that no country reminds the traveller of the *old one* as Van Diemen's Land.'⁷¹ He praised especially the irrigation works carried out on the best farms, a feature also approved by Denison. Agricultural science probably did reach a higher level in the island.

As studying the *Herald* has already indicated, the gentry sometimes used their political influence to strengthen the landed interest. During the 1843 election several candidates suggested a local corn law, addressing themselves to large farmers rather than any peasant group. Many supporters of the scheme were shamefaced (Berry being exceptional in fervently urging Protection), and the legislative technique they adopted was to tack high duties on a government Bill intended to diminish smuggling of spirits.⁷² Gipps returned the Bill to Council with disapproving comments. In the ensuing debate the liberal William Bland supported the Governor's stand, castigating the move as a 'tax for the relief of landlords';⁷³ but the gentry and their supporters reaffirmed the Bill which was therefore reserved, and finally disallowed by Downing Street. Meanwhile the same group had supported Richard Windeyer's plan to remedy the current economic distress by persuading the government to issue currency on credit to owners of land. The executive was not impressed and so the scheme died.

A Usury Bill introduced by Wentworth in the 1843 session failed to pass the Council. A more moderate Bill did gain majority support the following year, only to meet Imperial disapproval.⁷⁴ In Tasmania the gentry, inside and outside the Council, had already tried to persuade Franklin to accept such a measure during the straitened months of 1843. 'In a colony wholly relying on Agriculture for its existence', they argued, 'without any foreign trade except what is absolutely necessary for its internal consumption, the Agricultural interests should be essentially paramount.'⁷⁵ The plea went unheeded, but the island gentry did receive the support of government in having considerable protection extended to their farm produce.⁷⁶

Their action in New South Wales politics gave a clear impression of the gentry's views on two complex subjects: the use of land by groups other than themselves, and the labour question. Consideration of the former must begin with 'old-style' squatters—men of humble status who ran a few sheep or cattle on land, usually within the county boundaries, to which no one held legal claim. Towards such people the gentry were implacably hostile. The evidence to the 1835 Committee on Police

degenerated at times into a catalogue of their alleged crimes. P. P. King provided one instance:

I cannot express myself too strongly on the subject of squatters. The mischief they do is almost incalculable. They harbour the settler's runaway servants; they steal his cattle and sheep; they receive stolen goods; they sell spirits on the 'sly'; they entice shepherds from the care of their sheep; and they shelter and feed bushrangers and afford them information.

Complaints like this induced Bourke to frame the Crown Lands Act of 1836, designed to check such lawlessness. The Governor was reluctant to act, suspecting that King and the rest were just greedily jealous of any competition for the use of land. However, the gentry's genuine concern for the establishment of law and order in the hinterland was re-emphasized in 1839 when another committee urged the extension of police control beyond the boundaries and the assessment of stock to raise the necessary funds.⁷⁷ The upshot was the Crown Lands Act of 1839.⁷⁸

W. A. Duncan, the most intelligent Roman Catholic layman in the community, often accused the gentry of hostility to the growth of a yeoman class. He stressed their antipathy to Russell's legislation of 1840, which had provided for the selling of land in eighty-acre lots. As with Bourke's suspicions, little direct evidence confirmed these allegations. Probably most gentry, while sympathetic to the growth of a dependent tenantry, looked askance at any other form of small-farmer interest. This was more definitely the case in Tasmania.⁷⁹

Far more important was the attitude of the settled landholders to 'new-style' squatting: the development of the pastoral industry by raising flocks on crown land, usually although not always beyond the boundaries. The issue was very tangled. Most gentry had always engaged in such squatting and when, from the early thirties, it developed as a separate interest, their loyalties divided accordingly. Sometimes they switched altogether. The balance could vary from estate to estate and from year to year according to fluctuations in the political situation and the distribution of the individual's resources. Nevertheless a real difference remained between squatter and gentry views of squatting.

Russell's dismemberment proposals, which threatened to indict stock-raising on unalienated land, prompted the gentry to work out a classic apologia. 'Whilst in the Midland district the Colonist has planted his home, where he is domesticated in the bosom of his family', ran a petition adopted at the great meeting of February 1841 and afterwards printed for distribution to all members of the British Parliament, 'he has embarked in the pasture grounds that portion of his capital to which he looks for the largest immediate returns, and for the surest provision for his posterity.' The Act, by raising the price of land and abandoning the auction system, opened the way for speculators and other intruders to undermine the old settlers. The petitioners deplored attempts to impose

Wakefieldian principles, especially concentrated settlement. On the contrary, they urged:

let the energies of the Colony continue to flow in the course indicated by Providence, and in due time concentration will follow as a natural result. The riches gathered in the wilderness will be stored in the towns and villages. Successive races will go forth in quest of the wealth yielded by the fleece, and will return with their acquisitions to the resorts of social life. As in the old world, wealth will produce leisure, and the union of the two will be followed by steady advancement in art, science, and all the elegances of prosperous and well-peopled cities.⁸⁰

These rolling sentences stated the essential gentry position: squatting was acceptable only when brought within the framework of land ownership and attachment to the soil. Amid the storms of the squatting controversy an element within the class always put this view. T. A. Murray's opinion, delivered in a report from a committee which enquired into the sale of Crown land (1843), was particularly important.⁸¹ He carried the attack on Wakefieldian theory so far as even to dispute the doctrine that money from land sales should subsidize immigration; rather, men who brought in labourers should be granted freehold land. The imposition of a uniform price should give way to a four-level scale, ranging from sixpence to twenty-six shillings per acre. Thus indefinite reliance on sheep-rearing would end; the prospect of 'farms, settlements . . . townships . . . population' arise once more.

The impact of the 1846 Land Act, which recognized squatting, hardened this attitude. James Macarthur expressed his opinion that the new regulations were 'calculated to repress, if not to render impossible, the settlement of *bonâ fide* proprietors, having a direct interest in the soil, and looking to the Colony as their home, and that of their children'.⁸² This theme underlay the report from a second committee on crown lands, 1847.⁸³ The long leases projected by the 1846 Act, together with the continuation of the pound-per-acre minimum price, were declared certain to vest the present squatters with near-permanent occupation of the land. 'The settlers object to these Orders because they confiscate the lands of the Colony; the squatters approve of them because they see no limit to the term of their occupancy under them.' The writer of this brilliant report was not a squire, but Robert Lowe; and the gentry divided in their attitude to his recommendations when they came before Council. Two years later, however, Lowe was joined by William Macarthur and Wentworth on a committee which argued on much the same lines as those of 1843 and 1847. Its report urged the British government to offer land at an economic price, even if its sole immediate use was for sheep-grazing. In vain was the Imperial authority called to heed 'the feeling which associates the possession of land, in the mind of every Englishman, with aristocratical birth and political power, the notion of stability

belonging to its possession, and the natural wish to possess that with which the eye has long been familiar'.⁸⁴

One further instance of gentry lobbying over land-use was remarkable. Soon after gold was discovered, Deas Thomson received a letter from James Macarthur, who urged that the government temporarily prohibit all mining; thus would end 'the deranging & upsetting of our social system to its very foundation, which is now to be feared' and 'spoliation' of the country's resources.⁸⁵ Never had Macarthur appeared so foolishly unrealistic; never had the depth of his feeling for the soil become more evident.

The squires' approach to the labour problem well characterized their social philosophy. On many issues members of the group might disagree, but probably every single one would have echoed this statement by Edward Macarthur, the brother who, while permanently resident in Britain, diligently fostered the family's Australian interests:

if . . . the influx of labourers into the Colony be inadequate, it will be difficult to maintain the broad basis on which the social pyramid should rest. Amongst every indigenous Race, the adjustment of the elements of Society seems to be so determined that by an all pervading law—they who possess Capital will be always proportionately few in relation to the numbers to be employed. And therefore when in a new Country, where the great portion of the people are not native Inhabitants, but have been, as Colonists, transferred from a distant country, Government, by positive or negative measures, permits an infringement of this wise order of Providence, an undue, and destructive competition for the Services of the labouring class must ensue—the Capital and substance of the Community will be squandered—and the elements of its prosperity dissipated. . . .⁸⁶

The class assumptions behind this statement and its special pleading were too blatant to require elaboration. Yet Macarthur and his fellows were sincere. The same basic feeling was expressed time and again, with obvious conviction, throughout the long struggle to establish an employer-employee relationship on the old world pattern.

It was a battle fought on several fronts. Some of the gentry—the Macarthurs, Berry, Campbell, Gilbert Ryrie among them—conducted their own private immigration schemes, working through agents in Britain to secure labour of high quality. Several attempts were made to float companies with the same general purpose. At the political level, the Council regularly appointed committees to urge upon the Imperial government the need for extended migration and the provision of funds. The agitation against dismemberment and against 'new-style' squatting both referred to the labour issue: in the former case, the land fund of each district was to be used for bringing out labourers to that district alone, with obvious threat to the welfare of central New South Wales; in the latter, more potential employers were entering the market without making any contribution to the land-immigration fund. This fund, indeed,

was the centre of endless debate and discussion. As soon as it began to dry up in the late thirties the Council discussed how it might increase: one favourite suggestion, never carried out, was that a loan be floated, the security for which would be future revenue from land sales.⁸⁷ Altogether the gentry played an important part in shaping the history of migration to Australia before the gold-rushes, but their efforts were never as successful as they would have liked.

Cheap labour schemes entered the discussion. Convicts, Chinese, Indian coolies, and Pacific islanders came under consideration from the gentry and others. But all, especially the first, created a dilemma. Macarthur had spoken against convict labour on several grounds in 1837: politically, its continuation threatened to strengthen the emancipist influence; economically, it was inefficient and tended to exclude high-quality free workers; morally, it tainted society and broadened the gap between England and the colonies. Many of the gentry never accepted this position and as soon as the Molesworth Committee made its report they protested.⁸⁸ Yet others continued to feel that only the free British proletariat could form the base of that social pyramid invoked by Edward Macarthur. 'If we give way to these moral objections we condemn the colony to death',⁸⁹ commented Edward Hamilton on one occasion when the resumption of transportation became a live issue. This nicely expressed the problem confronting his class. Accordingly the New South Wales gentry were divided and uncertain whether or not to press for revival of the system; James Macarthur himself had returned to favouring this step by 1841, but failed to carry even his cousin Hannibal with him.⁹⁰ This division helped explain the erratic course pursued by the legislature before it expressed definite opposition in 1850. Even then James Macarthur and Wentworth joined in trying to persuade their fellow legislators to adopt a less absolute policy. They urged that instead the colony bargain with the Imperial government to ensure that many free migrants accompany the convicts; Wentworth, anticipating the debate on the Australian Colonies Government Bill, emphasized that the purpose of Council was not to represent 'the mere popular interest', but to heed also the benefit of minorities.⁹¹

In Tasmania the probation system had created a different situation. Labour was plentiful enough, but the stigma of convictism was more potent. Probation, too, involved high police expenses, without providing gratuitous labour, as had the old assignment system. In consequence the Tasmanian gentry attacked transportation far more strongly than did their peers in New South Wales. Yet a minority supported continuance.

The discipline of the labour force provoked as much concern as did its supply. This dated back to the era when the Hunter River clique led vehement attacks on Bourke's system of convict discipline.⁹² The gentry felt that the government applied false philanthropy and thus barred them from having an efficient labour force. So Hannibal Macarthur explained his preference for free labourers:

by the present system of convict discipline, there is not a sufficient restraint upon these men, to prevent the indulgence of their vicious propensities. It is therefore desirable to obtain free men at liberal wages, for all agricultural purposes, as the stoppage of wages for losses occasioned by neglect of duty, operates as a better check upon the free, than the present convict discipline on the bond. . . .⁹³

When free labourers became better known, however, the employing class found them intractable. The consequence was a series of Master and Servant Acts (1841, 1845, 1847)⁹⁴ passed primarily through the influence of T. A. Murray. 'As all operations of civilized life are carried on through the medium of masters and servants', wrote Murray in the report of a committee which considered the 1845 legislation, 'it is necessary that the laws which regulate their mutual intercourse should be stringent and impartial.'⁹⁵ This fairly described the Acts as they appeared in the statute book. Yet inevitably they fell more heavily on the worker: significantly, Murray emphasized that the 1845 Act would work only if the executive allowed the local magistrate a strong hand.⁹⁶

Actual and Potential Allies of the Gentry

From the very early years of its history, Sydney boasted a handful of merchant princes having economic and social affiliations with the gentry. Paramount among these was Robert Campbell, who first traded between Sydney and Calcutta in 1798, years before he founded the settler family already mentioned. Of similar stamp was Richard Jones, who, like Campbell, enjoyed membership of the old Council and there advocated the interests of the country gentlemen. Jones's junior partner at one time was S. A. Donaldson, founder of the Australian Club, a future Premier of New South Wales, and always very conscious of respectability and its prerogatives. S. K. Salting, a Dane whose fortune was in the next generation to build up one of the great western collections of Sinologia, and T. S. Mort, perhaps the grandest figure in Sydney's commercial history, were both ardent Anglicans and otherwise upholders of the established powers. When Sydney's merchants first took to direct action in politics—at the general election of 1848—their candidate was John Lamb, formerly an active member of the Justices' opposition to Bourke and a nominee legislator. Francis Kemble, manager of the embryo Colonial Sugar Refining Company, was one of the most outspoken Tories in the colony; interestingly, the Council sought to protect locally refined sugar in its abortive corn law.

From the professions came further support for conservatism. William Henty, Launceston solicitor and member of the famous gentry family, wrote a classic argument in favour of establishing tenancies. Hastings Elwin was a financier, a classical scholar, and a non-official nominee to the New South Wales Council, who joined, for example, in deprecating the tone of the 1844 land committee. William and Arthur à Beckett,

lawyer (later judge) and surgeon respectively, brought to Sydney the standards of the Wiltshire gentry to which their ancestors belonged; the former was patriarch of the Boyd family, to whom Australian culture becomes more heavily indebted with each generation. Of comparable stature was Charles Nicholson, a surgeon who deeply marked the political and cultural history of his adopted country. His conservatism prompted the comment that the Australian Colonies Government Bill threatened to give all political power to 'the democratic population of the towns';⁹⁷ he would have preferred universal to £10 suffrage, as then employers could have influenced their workmen's vote. Nicholson once remarked that one factor making colonial life tolerable was the opportunity it gave every individual of quality to affect the course of history.⁹⁸

The support given by Judges Pedder and Burton to the Church of England's claim to exclusive establishment bespoke their general conservatism. Burton echoed all the major exclusive criticisms of Bourke's government, particularly emphasizing the prevalence of crime in the community and the consequent danger of granting civil rights to ex-convicts.⁹⁹ James Macarthur pressed the Colonial Office to appoint Burton as Chief Justice following Francis Forbes's retirement.¹ Among other officers of government were several individuals of similar outlook, Alexander Macleay being the prototype. Even Deas Thomson moved steadily rightwards from his father-in-law's liberalism, strongly supporting 'representation of interests' in the 1851 constitutional debate. C. D. Riddell, Colonial Treasurer in New South Wales, has appeared as the Justices' standard-bearer in their attack on Bourke and Therry; he seconded Broughton's high Tory argument against the separation of Port Phillip. John Gregory, Treasurer in Tasmania until 1840, upheld the Church of England against the threat of liberalism. The diary of G. T. Boyes, Auditor and briefly Colonial Secretary in the island, revealed a man of culture and refinement appalled by the turbulence of colonial life. He felt the need for cohesion of society ('the better class I mean') to resist convictism and 'the Mob'.² Most other officials remained politically anonymous.

What of the highest functionaries—the Governors? All respected the gentry, yet formed no alliance with them. One reason was the clash of Imperial and local interests; another, the importance attached by the Governors to adjudicating between different interests rather than aligning behind any particular one; a third, that Bourke, Gipps, Eardley-Wilmot, and even Franklin, all inclined to liberalism. This left Denison and FitzRoy; both ultimately looked to the gentry's opponents for political friendship,³ but both were genuine conservatives.

Sir William Denison stood out as the one Governor who set himself against the current trends of constitutional history. 'There is', he wrote to Earl Grey in 1848 apropos the draft Australian Colonies Government Bill, 'an essentially democratic spirit which activates the large mass of the community.'⁴ He consequently urged the formation of a second

chamber which would lift its members above 'the broad plain of equality'. In terms which suggested that he had read de Tocqueville before coming to Tasmania, Denison argued that a few colonists aspired to such distinction, but the jealousy of their fellows frustrated them. He hoped that the second chamber would help the executive to check the legislature's expected demand for power. When the Bill became law, the Governor wrote many letters to Deas Thomson, seeking advice on how to stem the incoming tide of responsible government. One passage summarized his political belief:

I, as you may imagine, am altogether opposed to those democratic principles which are advocated by those needy hangers-on upon society . . . with whom the world is but an oyster which they are anxious to open in order to get at the fat juicy interior . . . In these Colonies the Government will always have to keep a steady pressure in opposition to the elastic force of this principle, which is most dangerous even in America. . . . What a state would you be in in New South Wales with an ignorant and vicious population . . . were you to throw political power into the hands of such a class.⁵

Denison believed in keeping a strong military force in Tasmania, 'and to have plenty of power at hand' lest insurrection break out. That gold was not discovered in his territory he regarded as a great boon.⁶

Sir William supported state endowment for religion, seeing in the voluntary principle the threat of ministers becoming slaves rather than leaders of their flocks.⁷ He suggested that both Anglican and Roman Catholic Bishops sit in the upper house of his proposed bicameral legislature. This departure from exclusivism was significant, for it was part of Denison's Erastian approach. He wanted all denominations to be endowed; brought against voluntarism the further objection that it left the working classes uncared for; and urged Nixon (of all people) to adopt Methodist techniques so that Anglican influence might spread amongst the poor.⁸

Denison was an ardent advocate of transportation. He believed that the system promised social stability and economic prosperity, viewing with horror the New South Wales situation where the shortage of labour had prompted insolence, sloth, and gross inefficiency. 'The remedy for this is to reduce the cost of labour, to bring it to a nearer relation to the cost of the necessaries of life, which can only be done by pouring in a steady supply.'⁹ Full of this conviction, apparently so congruous to the gentry's own attitude, he entered battle with the anti-transportationists, among whom were many of that very class.

FitzRoy's policies were a pale reflection of Denison's, but still more palpable than is often supposed. He too believed in an upper house as a check against the legislature; looked with distaste upon the rising democracy; and thought that transportation benefited the colonies as well as Britain.¹⁰ In one important particular—attempting to reduce the quit-

rents still payable on granted lands—he showed positive sympathy for the gentry. Defending his actions on this score against the Colonial Office, FitzRoy emphasized his concern to save ‘many of the oldest and most respectable inhabitants’ from distress.¹¹

It is an old tradition that the ‘new-style’ squatters included many persons of high social calibre. Scrutiny reveals exceptions, yet the basis of truth remains. One of the number claimed for his fellows ‘the knowledge of . . . being a superior caste, their pride being to act after that knowledge’.¹² The *Australian*, in its conservative phase, and the *Herald* saw such men as ‘altogether of a superior mental caste’, and potentially forming ‘an Australian aristocracy’.¹³ The very nature of the land, in which only large pastoral holdings could offer great profit, seemed to vindicate such pretensions. No wonder then that Murray and the rest sought to bring the newcomers within their embrace. These circumstances seemed to point to the development of a vastly stronger conservative group, with an unshakeable moral, political, and economic hold over the country. In reality, squatting had the contrary effect. To explain this will involve completing the story of the gentry.

PART TWO

Factors Disrupting Conservatism

‘THAT GIGANTIC ANOMALY, THE SQUATTING SYSTEM OF NEW SOUTH WALES’

FAR FROM STRENGTHENING conservative power, the squatters wreaked havoc. They did so not from any innate wickedness but from economic necessity; the pastoral industry, even Nature herself, was the ultimate villain of the story. The gentry themselves acted as disruptors when engaged in wool-growing, even in terms of their own ideal; many squatters yearned to forsake their way of life. Yet they must appear not as heroes of the golden fleece or happy spirits of the wilderness, but as men acting without grace or restraint or care for the public good. As their efforts underpinned the economy, this behaviour carried all the more weight.

Squatters and Law

‘The first principle of squatting’, wrote Gideon Scott Lang, one of its most able practitioners and spokesmen, ‘is, *That the Squatter shall have full power to settle without restriction wherever he can find unoccupied pasture, and to take possession of as much land as his stock can occupy.*’² This perfectly expressed the squatter’s feeling that his needs, not any superior authority, should determine the conditions under which he operated. The justification for this claim was simple. Until squatters drove forth their sheep, the land had been entirely unproductive; this new movement introduced civilization and converted the wilderness into wealth. ‘Those persons who first reclaimed the land from a state of barrenness, the persons who first turned the forest land to their own use, have surely a far better title to the soil than the Queen of England, or any other body.’³ In such arguments lay a squatter theory of value, analogous to that with which Karl Marx was soon to bolster the claims of the proletariat. Gipps himself, against whom the squatting interest was to launch its fury, stressed the movement’s part in maintaining the prosperity of New South Wales and South Australia and in adding Port Phillip and New Zealand to the Empire, with little charge to Britain.⁴ The dependence of the economy on wool was undeniable.

That seemingly immutable conditions determined his life strengthened the squatter’s conviction that he had an overriding claim to consideration. ‘The Government . . . had tempted him to a colony, to remain within whose narrow limits was to starve’, the stockholders of New South Wales told Lord Stanley in 1846, ‘and it was the hope of existence, and not

free agency, which led him beyond them. Thus the victim of a necessity which he had not contemplated when leaving home, the emigrant became squatter.⁵ Yet the common attitude to this class was distrust, even contempt. So there grew up among the squatters a feeling that every outside interest was against them 'in hatred and malice unaccountable'.⁶ All these influences made towards irresponsible aggression in law and politics.

This became manifest throughout the history of land policy. In early years no regulations controlled squatters, who thus acted outside, if not in defiance, of the law. In the mid-thirties squatting expanded more rapidly than ever before, the occupation of Port Phillip being one important chapter. To P. P. King the situation in this district was 'anarchy'.⁷ Legally, the description was fair. Right throughout the period some squatting had no warrant from government.⁸

The first significant legislation was Bourke's Act of 1836. Even this aimed primarily to regulate 'old-style' squatting, but inevitably the new was also affected. Very important was the institution of Commissioners of Crown Lands, through whom Bourke hoped to safeguard the small, 'old-style' squatter from his wealthier competitors. From the beginning, therefore, the big pastoralists disliked these officers of the law. The gentry were hostile to the extension of the Commissioners' powers by Gipps's 1839 Act. The outback squatters of the forties magnified this antipathy, until it became a major element in their political thought. 'We demand security in our tenures, repayment for our improvements at a fair valuation, and especially proper limits to the powers of the Crown Commissioners', wrote one squatter in 1842.⁹ He might have been a resident of the Western District of Port Phillip, throughout which Commissioner Foster Fyans was a much-hated man. On occasion Fyans and his fellow-officers probably did abuse their powers, but the hostility they met sprang largely from the squatters' indiscriminate rejection of authority.

This issue bulked large in the 'Lee case' of 1842—a very important clash between the gentry engaged in squatting and the government.¹⁰ William Lee, a landowner, had his squatting licence cancelled when his servants, moving herds westward beyond Bathurst into an unauthorized area, fought with some aborigines. The cancellation was the work of a commissioner, and a public meeting at Bathurst fiercely attacked his action. The meeting petitioned the government henceforth to grant licences on the advice of three local magistrates, whose superior knowledge would enable them to exclude 'dishonest and disreputable characters'. James Macarthur and John Blaxland supported the petition when it came before the legislature. Gipps replied:

the petition was put forth in order to try the strength of the squatting interest against the strength of the Government; or on a still more important matter, the administration of the domain of the Crown by the Government . . . he was bound therefore to protect the Crown lands . . . for the benefit, not of any particular class of people here, but for the benefit of the whole British empire.¹¹

This incident belonged to the gentry's attempt to mould squatting as they wished, but it well showed the hostility between squatting and the rule of law. An outright clash between these forces loomed inevitably. In 1843 an incident similar to the Lee case, involving one Weston, further hastened this climax.¹² Concurrently the true, 'new-style', squatters became more united and more aggressive.

The showdown came in April-May 1844 when Gipps issued his famous double set of propositions, one stating terms under which the squatters could occupy land, the other opening the way for purchase over an extended period. Reasonable as these suggestions were, fierce protests at once found expression through public meetings, an organization called the Pastoral Association (Melbourne's counterpart was the Mutual Protection Society), very active lobbying in Britain, and the local legislature. A committee on land grievances, in 1844, was particularly outspoken.¹³ Leading advocates for the cause were the Boyd cousins, Benjamin in the colony and Archibald both there and in Britain, W. C. Wentworth, and, for a while, Robert Lowe, who directed the *Atlas* newspaper. Ben Boyd, Wentworth, and Lowe sat at different times in the legislature, where the squatting interest also had the support of Henry Dangar and J. P. Robinson, a financial associate of the Boyds. The positive demands of the interest were for security, the right of pre-emption, and compensation should land improved by the squatter be sold to someone else.

In reality these claims were expressed in a negative form—that is, by reference to what the squatters denied. First, they refused to accept the right of the Imperial government to control land policy. This, the argument ran, was the province of local government: a stand, as Gipps said, 'in opposition to all Constitutional Law and the positive enactment of Parliament'.¹⁴ At a meeting held in Sydney on 9 April, Wentworth asserted that the Crown had been acting as 'but the trustee for the public';¹⁵ now the beneficiaries had come into their inheritance and demanded full control. Accordingly any land tax not sanctioned by the local Council was illegitimate. The squatters insisted that acceptance of the assessment imposed by earlier Acts did not imply recognition of the Crown's rights over the land, but was merely a co-operative act. Gipps's proposals were obnoxious and invalid. Lord Stanley was appalled that men like Boyd maintained this position:

I cannot suppose that such a charge would be made by Gentlemen of the talent and station of those who have advanced it without grounding it on some foundation; but, unless it is intended to be denied by them that the right of property in the Land occupied by them is vested in the Crown, I am at a loss to conceive by what reasoning it can be established. . . .¹⁶

As the *Herald* remarked, the crux of the squatters' case *was* precisely this.

Would the squatters have objected to the payment of any tax they

considered unjust, even if imposed by the local Council? Probably, yes: their arguments, especially the squatter theory of value, could easily meet this case. Boyd declared that a £10 fee should vest the occupier with freehold,¹⁷ and the Pastoral Association argued generally against the investment of capital in land.¹⁸ The claim to dominion appeared also in the grievances committee's argument that Commissioners' powers should rest with tribunals of local pastoralists.

A touch of sedition flavoured the campaign against Gipps. The *Atlas* argued that the squatter had no other choice than 'ruin or rebellion'.¹⁹ John Dunmore Lang, another temporary advocate of the squatters' cause, reported that he had heard some discuss their right of taking action against the Governor. 'The best thing they could do with Sir George now would be to Bligh him', suggested one; another, that twenty good stockmen could defy 'any regiment in her Majesty's service'; a third, that the soldiery might switch loyalties in return for twenty acres and a few cattle apiece.²⁰ C. P. Hodgson, the man so conscious of the squatters' pride of class, approvingly described how 'the republican spirit exploded' in 1844.²¹

Throughout this year the squatters remained at white heat. There followed some months of relative complacency, as feeling grew that lobbying in Britain was having the desired effect. However, two Bills introduced into the British Parliament during 1845 disappointed these expectations, and so ill-feeling revived. Attacking the second Bill in January 1846, the squatters described the selling of leases by auction as no less pernicious than direct sale of land. The speculator would blackmail the bona fide pastoralist; the latter's expenses would rise; the 'Sydney capitalists' would tighten their hold.²² Later in 1846 the squatting interest in Council successfully opposed renewal of the Act which provided for the Border Police. In earlier years the legislature's power over the Estimates had been used to weaken the commissioners, but this new action approached outright anarchy. The squatters warned that if the government persisted in obstructing their wishes, battle would continue.

No wonder then that conservatives were shocked. Not only had the squatters anticipated Marx's theory of value, but they were seeking dictatorship of their class. When Broughton told Coleridge that the squatters would establish 'a democracy of the worst sort', he meant a government which would deny settled authority and tyrannize over minorities. Similarly the managers of the *Australian* told James Macarthur that the anti-Gipps front would arouse a 'strong democratic influence' to secure their aims.²³ The *Australian* anticipated the *Herald* in denouncing the squatters as ruthless offenders against the ideal of a co-operative community. The argument came to have general currency. Conservatives like Cowper and Nicholson, liberals like E. S. Hall, Richard Windeyer, and Lowe, radicals like J. D. Lang—all became enemies of the squatter after having supported the protest of 1844. Typically, Lowe best justified this change:

he advocated fixity of tenure for the squatters then, because they sought it as against the Crown. Now he opposed it because they sought it as against the rights of the people. . . . He thought then the squatters fought for liberty, but he found they fought only to defend their breeches pocket.²⁴

These words were spoken in mid-1848. By then the legislation of 1846-7 had ensured that squatters need not pursue the threat implied in their attack on the Border Police. On the contrary, in 1847 Wentworth and Robinson voted with the government against Windeyer, Lowe, and others, to pass an assessment measure which raised a fund for police purposes.²⁵ During the debate both sides agreed that rejection or acceptance of the Bill amounted to rejection or acceptance of the new squatting legislation. Coincidentally H. Wills, a Port Phillip squatter, denounced the idea that the local legislature should take over land policy from Downing Street. He bolstered his case by reference to 'the ravings of democracy, and the vicious outpourings of infidelity'.²⁶ During the 1848 elections another squatter proudly designated the group supporting the interests of his class as 'the constitutional party'.²⁷ Two years later one Charles Tindal declared his fellows' suspicion of the proposed unicameral legislature 'as the Townspeople will outnumber us in votes, tho' far behind in property and intelligence'.²⁸ The change in land policy had revolutionized the political situation; the squatters were now ready to become thoroughgoing reactionaries. The Australian Colonies Government Act set up only one chamber; but it granted leaseholders the vote, and the squatting interest gained from the 1851 redistribution of electorates, which favoured rural areas. So events prepared for the squatters to win political supremacy. In fact the gold-rushes and other circumstances denied this consummation, so it remains unknown whether these men would have provided comparatively disinterested leadership such as Broughton and James Macarthur might have approved.

The evidence suggests that irresponsibility would still have marked squatter politics. The squatters continued hostile to restraint, even when they had won the battle on land tenure. Commissioners were still disliked. A separation movement in the Moreton Bay area sprang from the local squatters' determination to have a subservient government. In 1845 the *Herald* denounced the Port Phillip separation movement as the work of radicals and squatters, and the latter remained active supporters of the cause. Thus John Cotton, of the Western District, in 1848 supported a move to force C. J. La Trobe from the Port Phillip superintendency, castigating him as 'one of those . . . who would maintain the divine right of Sovereigns, and would require abject submission from every person beneath his own dignity'.²⁹ The squatters' behaviour in the colonial legislatures of later decades rarely rose above barren negativism, although this was probably a natural reaction to the ever-increasing power of other interest groups.

So far, the squatters' rejection of authority has been considered chiefly

in relation to politics. Yet their way of life also encouraged a frontier lawlessness not essentially different from its more celebrated and lurid counterpart in North America. The discouragement of Commissioners and Border Police was significant: they were the men through whom authority operated in the outback. Naturally, direct evidence of law-breaking is sparse, but an occasional glimpse broke into the record. William Gardner, who tutored squatters' children in New England, noticed that early arrivals in any district believed 'that they had a right to deal out, & dictate to those who came after'.³⁰ The pastoralist's land hunger prompted desire for isolation, and so ruthlessness in his relations with others. In 1850 one squatter returned to New South Wales from overseas to find that his agents had sold the rights to his property; the transaction appeared illegal so he took forcible possession, chopping down the new occupier's hut and driving him out.³¹ While representing Port Phillip in the legislature, J. D. Lang heard from a Western District squatter, who complained that Fyans had refused him a licence. In consequence, neighbours encroached upon his run.³² 'Possession is the only Sure Claim here', remarked Niel Black, another Western District man, in relating the similar offences of two 'dirty mean fellows' who had come into his district.³³ Black, a stern Calvinist, also noted the readiness of even his most honourable peers to engage in fraud.³⁴ From Moreton Bay, Walter Leslie confirmed that 'the insecurity of life and property in the wilds of Australia is *considerable*'.³⁵

The lawlessness of frontier life became most clear in the relations of woolgrower and aborigine. 'I believe,' wrote Black, 'they, poor creatures, are Slaughtered in great numbers and never a word Said about it';³⁶ 'we gave them what they will not forget in a hurry',³⁷ exulted George Leslie, after describing a native raid on his flocks. The parties concerned had urgent reason to destroy all evidence, but undoubtedly the aborigines suffered all sorts of outrage. Sometimes, as at Myall Creek, they were massacred by gun-fire; sometimes by such covert means as arsenic poisoning. Even a squatter who felt interest and affection for these people would condone his fellows taking the law unto themselves to punish incursions on sheep and cattle.³⁸ T. A. Browne, the squatter-turned-novelist, frankly regretted the need to behave in a quasi-legal manner in these affairs.³⁹ The grievance rankled with every woolgrower, from the pride of the gentry to the man on the frontier edge.

Those in Port Phillip had a particular complaint. British philanthropists, working on the sympathies of the Imperial government, had succeeded in having established there a native Protectorate. To the squatters, this was an abomination: the Protectors encouraged the aborigines' pretensions and so made bloody strife all the more inevitable;⁴⁰ moreover the Protectorate threatened that land, precious land, might be reserved for native use. Exeter Hall—headquarters of the British 'feather-bed philanthropist'—became an open target. The colonial legislators frequently disputed the annual provision for the Protectors in the Esti-

mates, and a committee which enquired into their work showed hostility.⁴¹

Treatment of the aborigines became a political issue on other occasions. The Crown Lands Act of 1839 won some support because it could lead to punitive action; the Lee case aroused resentment, since the government appeared to put the natives' interests above the woolgrowers'. Most significant of all, the elected legislature reversed the policy of the nominee Council and twice (1844 and 1849) refused to validate the giving of evidence by natives in criminal cases. The Colonial Office insisted on the need for such action, and the local government too felt strongly, but even in 1849 Lowe and James Macarthur joined with Wentworth in opposition. The *Herald* rebuked 'their cool suggestions for the coercion of the blacks by brute force, and their scarcely concealed wish that the law and the Government should connive at the extermination of the race'.⁴²

When supporting the Lee petition, James Macarthur recognized that the pastoralists were advocating an attitude towards the aborigines contrary to British thought. Even within the colony various observers were critical, and so the woolgrower again found himself accused.⁴³ In defence he could only repeat the plea of necessity and a version of the squatter theory of value:

the worthless, idle aborigine has been driven back from the land that he knew not how to make use of, and valued not, to make room for a more noble race of beings, who are capable of estimating the value of this fine country. Is it not right that it should be so?⁴⁴

Perhaps the writer himself was uncertain of the answer.

Squatters and Other Classes

The growing dominance of squatting affected other groups in various ways. The common result, however, was to make each less suited to the role which conservatives would assign them. This was most obvious in the case of the gentry, for they—nucleus of conservative power—were destroyed by the new movement. Chapter 2 suggested the divergence of the two interests, especially by reference to the gentry argument that the government should resolve the squatting problem by selling land at a moderate price. The motive was more than to enshrine land-ownership as an ideal. Many of the gentry still owed quit-rents on property originally acquired by grant; throughout the thirties many had invested further capital in purchasing land, which they had then seen depreciate in the depression years. If the squatter was to compete in selling wool and attracting scarce resources without investing any capital in land, he would have a tremendous advantage. Freehold land, far from being the means to comfortable independence, would become a crushing burden. So, in fact, matters turned out.

Squatters and gentry did have some interests in common. When W. A.

Duncan analysed this link in 1845, he stressed both parties' use of unalienated land for grazing, and their hostility to district councils.⁴⁵ He said further that the gentry's lands were so heavily mortgaged that some had ceased to think of themselves as landowners. To this list must be added the gentry's particular reasons for hostility to Gipps's land policies—he tried hard to collect arrears of quit-rents and otherwise to tighten administration within the counties. These strains often blended together, especially in the storm of 1844.

Nevertheless, the gentry and their sympathizers often felt a jealous antipathy for the newcomers. Richard Jones hoped that the 1839 Crown Lands Act would not allow the squatter freedom from any obligation beyond licence and assessment fees; instead 'let him buy land as the old Colonists have done'.⁴⁶ Robert Scott declared in 1842 that squatting had 'materially contributed' to the distress of agriculturists by depreciating land values and making sales impossible.⁴⁷ Supporting Gipps during the crisis of 1844, Edward Hamilton argued that the Governor 'dare not sacrifice the public interests to encourage the monopoly of a class'.⁴⁸ Several landowning witnesses before the grievances committee likewise refused to accept the Boyd-Wentworth viewpoint.⁴⁹ The address to Gipps regretting the committee's violent language emphasized this dissenting strain, and the Macarthurs' aspersions on the Council's behaviour through 1843-4 pointed against the squatting interest. Archibald Boyd's defeat at a by-election in Port Phillip in 1845 probably was a further chapter in this story:⁵⁰ only property *owners* then had the vote.

As the gentry interest declared more emphatically after the legislation of 1846-7 that land should sell at an economic price, rather than be available on long, cheap leases, so its positive antagonism to squatting became more explicit. A series of motions put to the Council by Lowe in September 1846 and the land committees of 1847 and 1849 revealed this feeling.⁵¹ So did a Council debate of May 1848 which culminated in a plea to the Imperial government that the payment of quit-rents be not enforced rigorously.⁵² 'Held down by a gigantic restriction, the holders of these grants could not thrive—they could not compete with those who occupied the waste lands of the Crown', argued T. A. Murray; 'by admitting the competition of the squatters, the Government had broken faith with the settlers.' In September 1848 Archibald Boyd suffered another electoral defeat, the electors of Moreton Bay apparently being swayed by propaganda against the 1847 Order.⁵³ Meanwhile anti-squatter feeling continued strong in Port Phillip. At one public meeting a suggested extension of the franchise to leaseholders was attacked, the leader of local landowners declaring

the squatters ought to be quite content with what they had got, without turning round on the landowners and taunting them with poverty; the boast came with bad taste from the squatters, for it was the landowners money which had raised them to their present wealthy state.⁵⁴

This agitation in Melbourne illustrated an alliance between agricultural and urban groups, which Archibald Boyd pointed out to the Colonial Office in 1849.⁵⁵ By controlling the press and having the advantage of inter-communication, he argued, this combination was able to exercise a malicious influence against the squatters. 'Between the counties and the districts, there always has been, and will be, bitterness of feeling and dis-sentiment', Boyd declared. 'The old settlers cannot forgive the squatters their long leases; the squatters cannot forgive the old settlers their free grants of land.' No one was better qualified than Boyd to judge, and few had done more to secure the victory of his party.

What, then, happened to the gentry? Many gave up their landowning interests and changed sides. Among these were some—Curr, Hobler, Drysdale, Russell—from Tasmania, whence the move to Port Phillip was especially strong. So 'conservative power' even in the island suffered heavy loss of men and capital. Ex-gentry felt the same pressures as other squatters, and behaved in the same fashion. George Wyndham, owner of Dalwood and custodian of British ways, became a particular object of the *Herald's* attack on squatter avarice and arrogance.⁵⁶ Of the gentry who did not become squatters, only a few survived the economic rigours of the forties. James Macarthur, FitzRoy, the *Herald*, all commented on the decline of the class late in the decade.⁵⁷ The ill-times currently suffered by King's School Parramatta, Sydney College, and the Australian College emphasized that the sons of the gentry were not being trained in the way of their elder brothers. When Samuel Bennett wrote the passage which introduced Chapter 2—that is by the mid-sixties—only vague, nostalgic memories of their glory remained. Yet gentry antagonism to squattocracy survived, being one factor behind the legislation of the sixties which ostensibly sought to 'unlock the land'.⁵⁸

* * *

Big men dominated the squatter party. Wentworth and Boyd held such enormous areas that the 1844 regulations threatened them with the possibility of paying out considerable sums; hence their antagonism had much more reason than did that of the rank and file. For the average squatter, indeed, Gipps's scheme might have settled rather than created worries. At the meeting of 9 April, Boyd and Wentworth emphasized that they were fighting on behalf of the large-scale operator. Conversely, the working squatter in the outback could not take part in political controversy. Gradually, however, a few hints of antagonism to the 'cormorant speculators' appeared from their less expansive colleagues. In August 1845 Boyd denied that the Pastoral Association ill-served the small man, but five months later James Macarthur learned 'there is evidently a split in the faction . . . the more moderate of them being quite content with the Governor's Regulations and the Big ones only looking to convert their squattages into Princely Leaseholds'.⁵⁹ Perhaps,

then, the lesser squatter might have suffered from the behaviour of the squatting interest.

The impact of squatting on the petty farmer also was uncertain. J. D. Lang reported that he had often heard squatters rejoice that labourers were improvident: if they saved their money and bought small holdings, their precious services would be lost.⁶⁰ Lowe and the *Atlas*, in their pro-squatter phase, declaimed against the idealization of *la petite culture*;⁶¹ G. S. Lang emphasized how foolishly optimistic were visions of the colony as thick with villages, townships, and farms.⁶² But after all, this was simple truth, and Lang carefully expressed admiration for the ultimate ideal of closer settlement. In time, some squatters began to form their own tenancies.⁶³ This evidence does not indicate unrelenting hostility towards the small agriculturist.

From the farmers' viewpoint, however, the picture was more positive. Among those few who took up the cudgels for Gipps in April-May 1844 was one Edward Powell of Windsor, apparently a modest yeoman:

hitherto the graziers had been keeping down the agriculturists; and whilst that was the case there was no outcry raised; but now that the Executive was wisely taking the burden off the shoulders of the agriculturists to put it on theirs, they began to squeak.⁶⁴

Gipps himself favoured enfranchising leasehold farmers because he thought it would reinforce his government against the squatter opposition.⁶⁵ His judgment was confirmed by the reaction of such men to the regulations which enforced the Act and Order of 1846-7. Two features were objectionable in their eyes: the apparent ruling that land was to be sold in lots no smaller than 640 acres, and the prohibition of farming for profit on leasehold land, the latter a common practice. Throughout the colony an angry campaign fought the regulations.⁶⁶ Some gentry joined in, partly because grantees suffered discrimination (in the matter of grazing rights over unalienated tracts) as against *purchasers* of land; partly because they believed the Imperial government had fallen dupe to squatter propaganda that the land was unfit for agriculture. In reply to these protests, the government declared that land would sell in small blocks, but allowed no reprieve for the leasehold farmer.

These regulations had no direct connexion with the central issue of squatting, yet did result from the anti-Gipps agitation of the mid-forties. They reinforced the natural obstacles in the way of settling numerous yeomen-peasants, who might have increased social stability. Instead, the prevailing attitude, even among those already established, was defensive antagonism. Two British travellers of mid-century discussed the situation with many small settlers. 'We are confident', they reported, 'that until a system is established of disposing of the waste lands in Australia in small lots . . . there will always be an unsettled feeling amongst the inhabitants.'⁶⁷ Although indirectly, the triumph of squatting was respon-

sible for this restlessness, which violated every dream of a Merrie Australia.

Pastoralism encouraged militancy among the working class also: many urban workers yearned to become yeomen (see chapter 4) and, perhaps too readily, blamed the squatter for frustrating them. A weightier grievance was the pastoralists' threat to maintain the competition of cheap labour. Most free workers hated the thought of employment on outback sheep-stations. By 1841 such men as Charles Campbell and Edward Hamilton had become fully aware of this 'strong dislike to the lonely, monotonous, and indolent life of a shepherd', the contempt of having interminably to 'crawl' after sheep'.⁶⁸ Workers' representatives testified to this effect before a Council committee which in 1843 enquired into the state of 'distressed mechanics and labourers'. They had to face queries which suggested that men who honestly desired work had only to go up-country to find it. Their repeated answer was that the venture appeared distasteful beyond contemplation. 'Do you not know that many gentlemen have been obliged to become shepherds?' 'Many gentlemen have perhaps brought that upon themselves, but we are not to blame for the condition we are in.'⁶⁹ This employment, it would seem, was temporal purgatory. The hardships of the country life bulked large in the workers' evidence: ex-convict overseers allegedly found 'a pleasure in oppressing free men',⁷⁰ and the fear of aborigines was strong. Payment in truck of outback workers aroused righteous ire—squatter documents prove that this technique was used to reduce wages.⁷¹ Witnesses further protested that payment by orders drawn in Sydney left them without recourse should their ex-masters' credit prove worthless.

Consequent upon such attitudes, the free working class failed to meet the woolgrowers' need for labour. In reaction employers looked elsewhere. They were probably all the more ruthless in doing so because of their experience with convict labour: one squatter explained that he considered ticket-of-leave men ideal employees because 'you have a check upon them, and they having undergone a certain degree of punishment are more cautious in their conduct'.⁷² Charles Campbell, while stating a personal preference for free labourers for social-moral reasons, admitted that his overseer—the practical man—found convicts better suited to shepherding.⁷³

The squatting interest became the chief force urging renewal of transportation. This was manifest, for example, in Archibald Boyd's letters to the Colonial Office; in the Moreton Bay separation movement, for local squatters resented every hindrance to their obtaining such labour; even perhaps in W. E. Gladstone's encouragement of renewal, since his family had ties with Niel Black. Responding to Gladstone's proposal, the squatting interest in the New South Wales legislature secured the appointment of the committee favourable to resumption. Ben Boyd was a major witness:

I believe that there is no employer of labour in the colony who would not prefer a ticket-of-leave man to a bounty immigrant; for my own part, although I came out here at first with all my English prejudices against the prisoner class, I now from experience prefer them so decidedly, that I have at this moment but few immigrants in my employment.⁷⁴

Wentworth led the rearguard fight in Council in favour of transportation, while outside the chamber squatters continued the pro-convict campaign. Meanwhile many had imported labourers, chiefly ex-convicts, from Tasmania,⁷⁵ a scheme which Boyd sought to improve by arranging with Denison for the import of men still under bond.

Woolgrowers were interested in obtaining coloured labour. In 1837 'certain Flock-owners' drew attention to the desirability of seeking coolies from Bengal, and one John Mackay undertook to manage the task.⁷⁶ G. F. Davidson, before becoming a settler, introduced some Chinese.⁷⁷ The issue remained prominent, reaching peaks with the organization of an association to import Indians (1842-3) and Ben Boyd's recruiting of labourers from the New Hebrides. As a result of these and other efforts such workers did enter Australia, but few proved satisfactory. The difficulties of language and acclimatization were massive, while the men showed a disconcerting tendency to independence.

Pastoralists at large rather than squatters in particular prompted these schemes, and some of the latter were as sensitive as any squire to the decivilizing effects, on the one hand of a labour shortage, on the other of a degenerate proletariat. Nevertheless, the expansion of squatting strengthened the drive to obtain convicts and coolies, and so the militance of the free British worker. The part of Boyd in the story symbolized the situation. Men who fought against buying land, and so against contributing to the fund for assisting free migration, bore particular responsibility for the labour shortage. From the workers' point of view the 'new-style' squattages had the disadvantages of being farther and farther removed from civilization, and so of being increasingly likely to expose them to truck, aborigines, and general ill-treatment.

Many merchants had interests in common with the squatters, but some—ranging from S. K. Salting to William Willmington, a petty storekeeper in a coastal town south of Sydney—condemned their greed.⁷⁸ Charles Nicholson probably represented the upper-crust professional men when he sneered at Ben Boyd's final downfall and departure: 'such is the climax of all the hectoring and pretension of this man'.⁷⁹ The remark corroborated Archibald Boyd's emphasis on the unity between town and agricultural groups against the squatter. But although Ben Boyd failed, the class he represented did not. Few admired the squatters, many suffered at their hands, all had to recognize their victory.

Squatters and Civilization

As well as disrupting politics and class relations, squatting tended to create social and cultural anarchy. The decline of the gentry worked against a sophisticated *élite* having direction over Australian society. Pastoralist-aborigine relations reflected not only contempt for law but crude ugliness of thought and deed. By common consent, the ideal immigrant was a young married Briton; he, his wife, and his children promised the best hope of a community sound in moral health and amenable to high ideals. The clash between such thinking and the squatters' cheap labour schemes was absolute.

Contemporaries developed this argument apropos both coloured and convict labour.⁸⁰ Broughton showed the unity of the two aspects when, writing the report of the 1841 committee on immigration, he opposed an Asian influx in terms very like those which his fellow Anglicans later applied against transportation:

whatever defects may be chargeable upon the state of society here, it is at present so unmixed in its composition as to promise to supply materials for the fabrication of a social and political state corresponding with that of the country from which it derives its origin.⁸¹

Gipps and the Colonial Office ranged themselves on the same side. The Governor stated his conviction that those who sought coloured workers were 'men . . . looking rather to their own immediate wants than to the ultimate good of the Country',⁸² and warned the legislature against the creation of 'a degraded class' analogous to the Negroes of America.⁸³ The councillors' response was flaccid, but years later the legislature did firmly oppose coolie labour. A move to have the Master and Servant Act extended to cover Pacific islanders failed, much to the annoyance of Boyd, who declared that this was the chief reason why these labourers did not give satisfaction. He also alleged that the Council acted maliciously in defeating the measure,⁸⁴ and feeling certainly ran high: "'Lock up the land" say they', so Murray represented the squatters' argument, "'keep down the immigration funds, and then we shall be obliged to have transported labour for nothing, or savages at next to nothing.'" ⁸⁵ Lowe called the government's attention to what he termed an incipient slave trade,⁸⁶ and the 1847 immigration committee denounced 'the evil of having to depend upon a coloured population for the supply of labour'.⁸⁷

Caroline Chisholm, mother-figure of Australian family morality, became an avowed enemy of the squatter 'capitalists' and their labour policies. There was every reason for this conflict. In 1838 the colonial respectability resolved that public money should not go towards importing persons who wished to settle in groups, or mechanics with their wives and children. 'An essentially Pastoral Country' required, above all, farm labourers and shepherds.⁸⁸ This meeting, perhaps hypocritically, paid respect to the ideal of a homogeneous population, based on the family unit. Some squatters in private, or even in public, made no

secret of their dislike for married shepherds, who were reluctant to move far from their homes and whose families burdened the station budget.⁸⁹

In so far as the squatter obstructed more fruitful use of the land, he further thwarted social development. Did he do so appreciably? The pastoral industry has survived without the help of convicts or coolies, but still agriculture does not spread throughout the eastern hinterland. Yet not only politicians, sentimentalists, and theologians declared that closer settlement was possible, but also people of moderation and practical experience. William Bland, T. A. Murray, the *Herald*—all asserted that sheep-rearing could only be a temporary basis for the economy, and that men must develop 'the superior resources of the land'.⁹⁰ Did the ghost of John Macarthur shudder as his son inveighed against those who acted 'as if this fine country had no higher destiny than to continue a sheep walk for ever'?⁹¹ P. P. King made a more immediate point:

land is not improved by occupation unless it is occupied with judgment—I mean by not overstocking it—but what cares the squatter—he puts as many sheep as he can on a small space & when the pasture is destroyed he moves off and leaves the ground a waste.⁹²

These attacks merged with condemnations of pastoral life as demanding little skill and being not at all creative. Squatters developed no attachment to the soil; they had no concern for the country beyond rape of its wealth. The statements of Broughton and James Macarthur were good examples of such argument, but the great anti-squatter philosopher was E. G. Wakefield. Dogmatic and often ignorant, he still was a powerful advocate of civilization for the colonies. Wakefield argued that dispersion thwarted the development of social relations, the division of labour, and so the culture of arts and sciences by a leisured upper class. He wanted no land used other than what was sold, and that at a high price; he wanted the waste lands of the colony reserved to Imperial control for the benefit of future generations; he wanted family migration. Few colonists had anything favourable to say of Wakefield, but to the squatters alone were his ideas thoroughly, irrevocably, alien.

Gipps was influenced by Wakefield, and his account of the squatting life infused that prophet's doctrine with a strength that could only come from knowledge and involvement.⁹³ Such arguments as Gipps's convinced the British civil servants who determined land policy that unless the problem of unregulated occupation was met 'a great calamity' would ensue.⁹⁴ Paradoxically, but with some logic, the government's answer was to capitulate to the squatters, hoping thus to reconcile them with law and society.

Among the bravest souls in the colonial community were the upholders of literary culture. Of these, the outstanding individual was Charles Harpur, native-born poet and philosopher. Harpur expressed his view of

the squatter in a sonnet 'On the Political and Moral Condition of Australia in 1845', dedicated to Gipps in admiration of his policies:

My country! I am sore at heart for thee!
 And in mine ear, like a storm-heralding breeze,
 A voice against thee gathers warningly.
 Lo, in *what* hands seem now thy destinies!
 Hands grasping all, through party means, to seize
 Some private benefit: and what should be
 Thy Freedom's dawn, but gives ascendancy
 To lawless Squatters, and the Hacks of these!
 Woe waits a land, where men are wise or brave
 For naught but self! Where even the best aside
 Are thrusting honesty to don the knave!
 Where worth is trampled on by vulgar pride!
 And where all beauty of the mind, decried,
 Hangs dying o'er a Mammon-delved grave.⁹⁵

Two of the best literary magazines published before 1850, the *Colonial Literary Journal* and the *Australian Era*, also attacked squatting: the former saw therein 'proofs of the poverty, decomposition, and mismanagement of society',⁹⁶ the latter remarked that, far from the well-bred and educated squatters making any contribution to refinement, 'the pursuit which, beyond all others, is at present most essential to the material interests of the colony, has morally and socially a debasing tendency'.⁹⁷

The squatters themselves clinched these assertions. Witness after witness to the grievances committee of 1844 depicted the barbarism into which insecurity of tenure forced the squatter. Some who pursued the argument might have been hypocritical, but there was ample reason for sincerity. Most squatter accounts which give a favourable view of the life were written in long retrospect or 'ghosted' at a distance; the one positive virtue noted by most contemporary participants was 'independence' or 'freedom', concepts close to licence and irresponsibility. Otherwise the squatters' own reports depicted misery and boredom.

This was particularly true of the accounts confided to diaries or intimates. There is no more poignant description than that given in a series of letters from William Forster, future Premier of New South Wales, to Vincent Dowling, at this time studying law in London on his way to the New South Wales Supreme Court Bench. 'A miserable sort of outlaw', Forster described himself, writing from the Molonglo plains, 'exerting the whole of my faculties in taking care of sheep and cattle'; and later, 'I am . . . stagnant in the depths of a half savage colony where mind feels itself like a galley slave brought to the oar taught to subject its power and impulses to the omnipotence of money.' Having moved on to the Clarence River ('purgatory . . . in the middle of all the romance of uncomfortable solitude'), Forster deplored 'the want of society, the want of books, the want of amusements' and found

himself hovering on 'a state of *smash* altogether'.⁹⁸ Women never accompanied pioneering parties, and even when a station was established, many a squatter was reluctant to gather his family about him. 'I cannot yet reconcile myself to bring you and the dear children up so far to be separated from all social comforts', William Campbell, another politician of the future, wrote to his wife; '... happy you cannot be in a wilderness like this.'⁹⁹ Similarly George Hobler felt genuine distress that his eldest son should pass his twenty-first birthday 'stowed away in a slab hut in the far west of New Holland'.¹

As Forster's letters illustrated, these men convicted themselves of rampant materialism. That the squatter was commonly a man of culture and respectable connexions increased his tendency to view Australia as merely a source of quick money. 'Had I given up friends, family, civilization, and dear old England, in vain',² asked one, as he set out to his station. Hodgson described how a man such as himself looked upon his sojourn in the colony as 'a few years of banishment', made bearable only by the hope of returning to his family free from poverty.³ 'Although called Settlers we are never permanently settled anywhere', wrote Niel Black in his journal; 'we have always an eye to returning home some day or other.'⁴

Thus the early squatters held their life in little esteem. Edward and Leonard Irby, sons of the Honourable and Reverend Dean of Peterborough Cathedral, would have liked to take Broughton's advice and become landowning agriculturists, but brute economics forced them to squat. Boyd could express the village settlement ideal as romantically as Charles Campbell himself,⁵ and at the whaling settlement of Boyd Town showed that, in different circumstances, he would act as well as speak. Wentworth forecast the danger of miscegenation arising from coolie inflow; Black feared that Tasmanian ex-convicts would create social havoc; and the Moreton Bay squatters felt ashamed at their efforts to introduce cheap labour.⁶ Yet all these people believed that they had no choice; each saw himself as 'a victim of necessity'.

When, after 1846-7, the squatters won their demands the attitude of many did change. They began to settle, to raise families, and to cherish culture, just as they became politically conservative. But, perhaps in reaction to long years of ostracism, they never approached social leadership. They were regarded with envy and hatred, which grew as their position became more secure. Yet had this security not been granted, the barbaric, lawless elements of squatting would have continued and increased. Meanwhile the industry which made the community wealthy and so prepared for national advance had magnified social tension. So appeared still more facets of 'that gigantic anomaly', which the *Herald* perceived in the squatting movement. 'Rights clash with rights, interests with interests', declared another editorial on the same problem, 'ill feeling is everywhere engendered.'⁷ In such a climate, the conservative ideal could not flourish.

RADICAL POLITICS: NEW CLAIMS AND CONFLICT

The Demand for Self-Government

EVERY COMMUNITY will produce citizens who seek to control its destinies, their incentive often being sheer fascination with political mechanics. Such men contributed largely to the claim for self-government in Australia. In Council they introduced legislation, presented petitions, sat on committees, scrutinized every executive move. Strengthening their efforts was the conflict of colonial with Imperial interest. Little high philosophy inspired the clamour for control of land policy, or the resistance to police and gaols expenditure, or the antagonism to the Ordnance Bills and the district councils. All these issues, and the excitement they aroused in New South Wales, sprang from a loathing of taxation too absolute for the twentieth-century mind readily to comprehend. It was equally strong in Tasmania, where the determination of councillors to resist every impost wrecked several important measures, Bills for civic improvement, road building, and primary education among them. Denison had a titanic clash with his judiciary over the legitimacy of a dog licence fee, Judge Montagu becoming a public hero when he argued against it.

The vehement attack on Gipps in 1844 differed only in degree from the general character of the campaign. Members of the elected Council in New South Wales quickly took the initiative from the executive, in contradiction to the spirit of the 1842 Constitution Act. Each year the Estimates were ruthlessly amended; through this power the legislature ingeniously expanded its influence; members even planned to reduce Gipps's salary, and thereby—so the Governor himself alleged—diminish his prestige.¹ Feeling rose high enough for Windeyer and Wentworth to suggest that the executive might use its power of detaining alleged lunatics to eliminate political enemies.² Tasmanian politicians had less scope for action, but pursued every opening. Eardley-Wilmot and Denison were embarrassed not only by the walk-out of the 'Patriotic Six' but further by the reluctance of other notables to fill the empty seats. Sir William also complained of 'the ardour of public meetings' which aspired to 'take upon themselves the whole of the legislative and executive functions of this government'.³ Boyes's diary noted the frustration suffered by Denison as he sought to govern the island with a strong hand.

Contemporaries were quick to classify the agitation as quasi-democratic. Boyes sympathized with the struggle against Denison, his own *bête noire*, but years before had described even the gentry settlers as 'all Radicals of the worst kind, and their children . . . brought up in the belief that all Governments are bad'.⁴ Chief Justice Pedder, Tory that he was, declared in 1838 that he would prefer a Council elected by universal suffrage to one composed of 'trimming, shifting, gentry';⁵ Eardley-Wilmot described the opposition voiced by the non-official legislators as 'radical, in fact Jacobinical'.⁶ These comments echoed criticism of the squatting interest's attack on the New South Wales executive. James Stephen, Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office, described an Act whereby New South Wales legislators sought to prohibit the election of government employees to Council as 'in the highest degree democratic and anti-monarchical'.⁷ Downing Street vetoed it accordingly. Following Wentworth's leadership of a successful move to reduce the number of police magistrates, and so to save government expenditure, one of those unemployed in consequence addressed him frankly:

the bugbear of your inmost soul is—an official. Of this class you were, early in life, a sort of victim. Power had for you nought but frowns, and a deep hatred of the tribe has grown with your growth and strengthened with your strength till you can see but a barren usefulness in the most necessary offices. A government officer is in your eyes a tool of power, an agent of corruption, the unblessed offspring of tyrannous rule, and you think you do the state good service when you rush upon the body with indiscriminate slaughter.⁸

Such anarchism permeated the whole movement for self-government, in which Wentworth played so notable a part.

The vigour of this cause stunted the growth of conservatism. It forced a wedge between interests which otherwise had much in common. The appointment of Denison to a community owning a tight-knit propertied class culminated not in a powerful conservative alliance but in fierce, deep conflict. This was the extreme example, but in varying degree all Governors save Bourke would have been happy to co-operate with precisely that class which, as taxpayers, bridled most under Imperial restraint. Conservative unity suffered further through disagreement as to how far the campaign for self-government should extend: the *Herald* regretted severe adjustments of the judicial Estimates; James Macarthur favoured district councils; many of the respectability refused Lowe's call to humiliate Gipps by boycotting the Queen's Birthday levee of 1845. Furthermore, constant onslaughts on the prevailing situation inhibited the growth of conservative theory. 'The law of the institutions of a new country is, not stability, but progress', declared an *Atlas* editorial in January 1845, making the point that the hybrid constitution of the day could attract nobody's loyalty. Conversely, the major argu-

ments advanced by colonial politicians *vis-à-vis* the executive—the right of self-determination, rigid government economy, no taxation without representation—were liberal in quality. Such outstanding spokesmen in the campaign as Wentworth, Lowe, and Windeyer were all innate enemies of Toryism, but no one could advocate the cause without veering leftwards. James Macarthur had to adopt the language of Whiggism in the early forties; Charles Cowper entered the legislature a Tory but after five years' active support of colonial rights allied himself with Lowe at the second general election. Men later taunted Wentworth himself for betraying the left, probably because fervent pleading for colonial independence had created an exaggerated idea of his liberalism.

Participants in the debate often referred to political rights. Usually the right claimed was that wealthier colonists have the same privileges as their peers in Britain, but sometimes the argument became more abstract. Thus 'the dictates of natural justice' were invoked by the Port Phillip separationists fighting their own small battle for financial autonomy.⁹ James Macarthur argued in similar terms in 1842, and was at once taken up by a radical, E. J. Hawksley, who insisted that natural law made no discrimination between rich and poor.¹⁰ This one specific example probably symbolized a general reaction: when rights are proclaimed, all conditions of men will apply the doctrine to themselves. Shortly after returning to England in 1850, Lowe—his opinion was uniquely significant—bemoaned that his fellow agitators were 'obliged, in order to make an impression on the British Government, to stimulate the passions and inflame the minds of the masses in the colonies'.¹¹ He warned that the longer self-government was delayed, the more turbulent would be the body politic in later years.

As early as July 1843 the Launceston *Examiner* argued that unanimous hostility to Imperial restrictions was the first cause which drove colonies towards democracy. The proposition remains firm.

'Australians' in New South Wales Politics

James Macarthur bewailed that emancipists tended to think of the colony as 'theirs by right', and saw in this attitude a threat to his own ideals. Thus he pointed to an important theme in colonial politics: the claim that convict background should not disqualify any man from political influence—even that it bestowed a particular right to affect the colony's destiny. To act on this belief was to take a position on the political left. It encouraged the demand for self-government, and so the attitudes described above; it entailed attachment to principles of civic equality, for ex-convicts had most to fear from the imposition of any inequality; and, most important of all, it was a movement of new men, if not poor men. Thus liberalism and the emancipist cause merged together. Liberals like Bourke, Sir John Jamison, and E. S. Hall supported

ex-convicts as a matter of intellectual conviction; William Bland happened to have come to the colony a convict, but would have played a similar part in local affairs whatever his personal history.

The most significant figure in the liberal-emancipist party was W. C. Wentworth. No causal relationship linked his leadership of the squatters and this role, but in both he could express that antagonism to ruling powers so well observed by the unknown psychologist already quoted. This account indicated another of Wentworth's traits important in this context: that he fought throughout life the battles of his early years. His mother was a convict; his father had suffered social ostracism from the exclusives. The readiness of convicts' sons to inherit their parents' quarrels helped to mould New South Wales politics and society.¹² Natives were active in every department of colonial life (among the gentry leadership and in running that conservative magazine, the *Politician*, to take two examples), but convict progeny felt and reflected their birth to an extreme degree. This, together with the peculiarly local character of the subject, prompts the use of the tag 'Australian' to describe the liberal-emancipist interest.

Wentworth was also characteristic in advocating continued transportation. The case for renewal had sound economic backing—the pastoralists' need of labour, the argument (which Bland ceaselessly advanced) that no colony could afford to export capital to subsidize migration—but it went beyond such considerations. Probably no 'Australian' planned to strengthen his party by urging the constant inflow of convicts, but it was natural that he should react against the cry that transportation had imposed a stain which must be erased with all possible vigour.

'Theirs by right'—what was the social background to this idea? The colonies had been founded primarily as convict dumps, and transportees contributed vastly to whatever civilization ensued. Travellers reported hearing old hands scorn 'bloody immigrants' and the 'self-imported devil'.¹³ Such observers as Hall and Caroline Chisholm declared ex-convicts as a class to be extraordinarily rich in the fundamental virtues, and so to deserve particular consideration.¹⁴ The memory of Governor Macquarie, the convict's friend, quickly achieved a mystical power. Wealthier ex-convicts acquired a reputation for philanthropy; the Sydney College proclaimed their devotion to higher learning. Fewer emancipists amassed great wealth as time went by, and probably there arrived fewer convicts who were non-criminal and had surpassing ability. Nevertheless, ex-convicts remained prominent among Sydney's plutocracy; Lowe declared that after the depression of the early forties they were relatively more powerful than before.¹⁵

The social cleavage between the tainted and the clean-skins also persisted. One statement, typical of many, emphasized the rigidity with which ostracism applied:

this you will say is hard . . . I grant it especially as regards the children of emancipists, for I am no admirer of the exclusive system, nor of the secret heart-burnings and open alienation and dissension that spring from it, yet . . . were you here with a young family, you would feel the power of public opinion, and secretly dread an intercourse that might lead to family connections, of which you could not approve, even while you were convinced that the peace and harmony of the colony required you to give your feelings and fears to the winds.¹⁶

Even the most successful ex-convicts—in a sense, particularly the most successful—must have smarted under this treatment. For such men a return to England might be feasible, but the likelihood of settling there happily was small.¹⁷ Their destiny lay in Australia, so they had strong incentive to adopt an aggressive, self-conscious determination to leave what mark they might.

The native element made its own contribution to the party's *mores* and strength. Broughton's lament over the Australians' disrespect for traditional belief found many echoes: most strikingly, perhaps, in the shocked dissatisfaction of a Sydney magistrates' bench when an eleven-year-old answered the conventional question about religious belief by saying he was a native!¹⁸ Inevitably, the local environment comprised most natives' universe, a narrowness which provoked an arrogance galling to many British travellers. Yet the assumption that local birth bestowed particular virtue extended beyond those who enjoyed that boon. The tradition that young Australians far outshone their fathers continued vigorous. 'The men manly and generous, the women beautiful and good' was one Briton's forecast of the future race.¹⁹

The political variant of this attitude was that a native instinctively possessed that much-belauded virtue, freedom from faction. 'A son of the soil—a sprig of the true Iron Bark', wrote a journalist in praise of Nelson Lawson, 'his sympathies and predilections are closely and inseparably interwoven with those of his fellow-colonists.'²⁰ This kind of argument, however near to hyperbole, was so common that it must have had some power. Candidates for election always claimed local birth when they could, and stressed their ties with the country. The transient money-seeker was scorned; the settled native won praise.

The first phase of 'Australian' politics in this period was the seven years' activity of the Australian Patriotic Association, founded in 1835 in expectation of the end of the 1828 Judicature Act. The title expressed the organizers' ambition to build a broad political front, isolating the hard-core exclusives and presenting them as anti-patriots opposed to the general welfare. Many latter-day movements for colonial independence have followed a similar plan. Such universality proved elusive, and the organization soon became simply the medium of liberal-emancipist opinion. Bitterly opposed to the exclusives' pretensions, the Patriots preferred a strong executive to local oligarchy. Still more desirable,

however, were representative institutions elected on a broad franchise. Above all, the Association insisted that—as in Britain—once a prisoner had served his punishment he should be eligible for full citizenship. Its whole case rested on the claim that, despite penal associations, the colony was a normal community.

One of the Patriots' achievements was to secure an agent—first H. L. Bulwer and then (1837) Charles Buller—in the House of Commons. When the Imperial government at last addressed itself to the colony's situation, Buller received from the Association a series of letters (written by Bland) which splendidly applied the liberal philosophy. These attacked the findings of the Molesworth Committee, which reflected the opinions of James Macarthur and urged the cessation of transportation. At this point the cleavage between the colonial liberals and E. G. Wakefield opened very wide; yet Wakefield inspired the British colonial reformers, among whom were Bulwer and Buller as well as Molesworth. The inevitable friction became hot in 1838-9, when Buller devised his own plans for constitutional reform. Bland told him that he had accepted the Molesworth-Mudie-Macarthur heresy; that the £10 franchise he proposed would hand over the colony to a rapacious plutocracy; and that to give such men plenary legislative powers would endanger even those civil rights already won. A £5 franchise and vote by ballot, to check the landed gentry's power over their tenants, were essential.²¹

During 1840 the Association addressed Buller on two related issues. One was the Municipal Bill which came before Council in that year. The controversy as to whether this legislation should impose any disqualification on ex-convicts roused the emancipists. The leading barrister, William à Beckett, argued their case before the Council, emphasizing that they had acted, and would act, as a party only when so compelled by exclusive hostility.²² Bland repeated to Buller that any disqualification was unconstitutional and would assist the most selfish interests in the colony.²³ Gipps's retreat from denying ex-convicts the franchise pleased the Association, but it regretted the shelving of the Bill, which promised some local control over taxation. The proposed £30 franchise was thought excessive. Meanwhile a Bill for taking a census had come before the legislature, and on Macarthur's initiative was amended to require all citizens to state whether they had arrived free or bond. Bland told Buller that this was intended to effect the exclusion clauses of the original Municipal Bill.²⁴ The legislation aroused strong feeling outside the House, vindicated when Judges Dowling and Stephen (not Burton!) declared that the offending clause contravened British law.²⁵ 'Arrived free' remained a separate census category, but pertinent information had to be supplied voluntarily or from independent sources.

Meanwhile, Lord John Russell planned to 'dismember' the colony and revise its constitution. In February 1841 Bland wrote Buller that

the Association warmly supported the principle of Russell's constitutional proposals. No wonder, for Russell had completely eschewed any discrimination against ex-convicts. Soon afterwards, he instructed Gipps that municipal legislation was to follow this precedent,²⁶ and Lord Stanley pursued the same policy in the 1842 Constitution Act. Bland could not have foreseen all these details in February 1841, but he probably realized that his battle was virtually won. Macarthur, very likely, concurred: hence his offer to bury ancient feuds. In fact, the Association had triumphed and now practically ceased to exist.

Exclusives and Patriots joined together in attacking dismemberment and so prompted Gipps's report in September 1841 that old animosities were fast disappearing.²⁷ He spoke too soon, forgetting perhaps that brief reconciliations had happened before. The events of 1841-2 did mark a dividing line in that the constitutional question of emancipists' rights subsided, but the old factions remained. Although representatives of the two groups sat together on the 1842 petition committee, tough bargaining went before,²⁸ and tension persisted. The Patriotic Association even sparked into life to urge a one-chamber legislature, which the *Herald* declared a 'Revolutionary Innovation'. The election of 1843 taught the same lesson. Macarthur and Wentworth might sit together upon a platform, but the latter and Bland won Sydney with a machine controlled by Samuel Lyons, archetype emancipist merchant.²⁹

Nevertheless the new legislature's early history added little to the 'Australian' tradition. Wentworth remained the outstanding protagonist of self-government, and was probably the most influential man in Council. Lowe, Windeyer, and Cowper were scarcely inferior, however, and the major issues of the period—squatting, education, finance—provided little opportunity for the coalescing of 'Australian' sentiment. The stronger thread of continuity ran through the rather shabby history of the Sydney City Council.

Bourke had suggested incorporation in 1835. The response was a public meeting which repudiated the possibility as threatening further taxation.³⁰ Bourke pursued his plan no further, but this opposition did not evaporate. When at last Gipps had overcome the emancipist obstacle, and notwithstanding the Patriotic Association's approval of incorporation, Wentworth and some wealthy ex-convict associates led an attack on the Act as a tax measure. Having failed, they pressed for a very high franchise—even £100 was suggested.³¹ The top echelon of the 'Australian' party was far from egalitarian.

The first municipal elections, held late in 1842 on a £25 franchise, were hard fought, and the results fell into a definite pattern. The urban upper classes—represented by Charles Nicholson, Alexander Macleay, Robert Campbell II, F. L. Wallace—fared very badly. Gipps described the victors' occupations: seven merchants, three butchers, two solicitors, two publicans, two tanners, two builders, a miller, draper, cabinet-maker, tailor, druggist—and one 'esquire'.³² No councillor was an ex-

convict, but around half were natives, and several of these the sons of ex-convicts.

This feature of the Council's composition was maintained, even strengthened, throughout the decade. It dominated the appointment of mayors, until 1849 elected from and by the councillors themselves. The first office-holder was John Hosking, whose selection the *Herald* deplored as rank 'Australianism'. Himself the son of a pioneer Wesleyan teacher, Hosking married the daughter of Samuel Terry (died 1838), the most successful of all ex-convict capitalists. He was succeeded by J. R. Wilshire, whose free immigrant father had established a tannery in Sydney forty years before. George Allen (1844-5), a solicitor and later a nominee Legislative Councillor, was superficially an unconventional choice, but he had connexions with Sydney College, had lived in Sydney from boyhood, and was the step-son of a convict. Henry Macdermott, another immigrant who became mayor, was a leader of orthodox radicalism. Thomas Broughton, the next incumbent, was the offspring of a Hawkesbury farmer, probably settled by Macquarie. The Reverend John McGarvie noted how emancipist feeling permeated this election, alleging that sixteen ex-prisoners or ex-prisoners' sons voted for Broughton.³³ Thomas Josephson (1847-8) was the only mayor elected before 1851 who had not sat in the first council: he and his two successors, Edward Flood and George Hill, were all natives. Flood's father was certainly a convict, the others' probably were.

The rejection of 'aristocratic' candidates in 1842 set the corporation on an anti-conservative course from which it never departed. Wilshire was an orthodox radical, as was Macdermott, and several other councillors had similar sympathies. Except in once petitioning the legislature to reduce the municipal franchise to £10,³⁴ the council pursued no policy particularly helpful to the workingman nor expressed any ideology, yet many established members of society regarded it with misgivings. This became clear in June 1844, when a public meeting discussed the 'insecurity of life and property in Sydney'.³⁵ The chief speakers were leading politicians of the Legislative Council, who painted a lurid picture. Their motive was almost certainly to discredit the corporation and frustrate its wish to manage the metropolitan police.³⁶ Later in the year, a committee of the legislature investigated the same subject and presented a highly-coloured report.³⁷ Again, when a government measure reduced the municipal franchise to £20, the legislature added the proviso that voters prove having paid rent for the past six months.³⁸ Wentworth's prominence in these manoeuvres showed again that the 'Australian' party was no monolith.

Year by year the reputation of the city council declined. At length (1849) the legislature appointed a committee, Lowe in the chair, to investigate its adversary. Many witnesses averred that councillors had used their position to improve their own property at public expense. Candidates spent up to £700 on election costs.³⁹ Particularly interesting

evidence was given by Henry Hollinshed, who had sat in the council in its first year, and shown himself a doctrinaire radical by arguing that mayor and aldermen should not wear robes of office.⁴⁰ Hollinshed told the committee that on council 'the class of convicts and their families always united against the class of emigrants'; the consequence was to revivify old animosities. Somewhat illogically for a radical, he traced the corporation's failure to the defeat of respectable men in 1842. Clearly, Hollinshed saw respectability as the antithesis of native birth. He believed too that some councillors sought election chiefly to gratify their wives' ambition to attend a Queen's Birthday Ball at Government House.

Lowe wrote a blistering report. The corporation, he said, suffered from cumbrous machinery and inefficient control; the mayor's allowance was excessive; many aldermen and councillors acted 'not with the desire faithfully to discharge the duties of the office, but to raise themselves to a false position in society'. The abolition of the corporation and its replacement by a paid commission were recommended. Much anger and some logic answered Lowe,⁴¹ and he failed to carry his proposals through the legislature. The Act 14 Vic. No. 41 substituted less sweeping reforms, including abolition of the ward system and provision for electing the mayor by mass vote. In the event matters went on much as before. The council had become the petty but appropriate medium through which middling-wealthy 'Australians' expressed their sense of unity and possession. The constant re-election of the same men suggests that they enjoyed general sympathy. Possibly the calumny they bore might have given them an appearance of martyrdom before men of similar parentage.

Since early in 1848 meanwhile, there had been gathering in the legislature a distinct faction, 'Australian' in experience and ideas; 'the Party' as one contemporary said, 'rooted in early associations, family connections, and local prejudices'.⁴² Wentworth was at its centre, together with G. R. ('Bob') Nichols, James Martin, and Robert Fitzgerald, all interesting men. Nichols's father, Isaac, was a convict of the early days; uncommon ability soon secured for him fairly important government offices, and he became wealthy enough to send his son to England for a few years' education. Nevertheless the latter returned to Sydney to learn the solicitor's profession, and did so very capably. In the later thirties he owned the *Australian*, which continued to preach an intelligent liberalism under the slogan *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*. Many public affairs attracted Nichols's interest. At the Anniversary Day dinner in 1842, he responded on behalf of the natives, denouncing transportation as a blot on the country and urging his brethren to prepare for militant action in the cause of self-government.⁴³ Many left-wing meetings listened to speeches which justified his self-description as a 'radical reformer'.⁴⁴ Meanwhile Nichols had become a leading freemason and, although an unsuccessful nominee for the City clerkship, won appointment as the corporation's

solicitor. He sat on the Parramatta district council, parading his native birth as a major electoral asset.⁴⁵

From June 1848 the 'Australians' had a useful ally in the newspaper *Bell's Life in Sydney*,⁴⁶ an emancipist-edited journal which now came under the part-ownership of Nichols's brother, Charles. This journal aimed at a mass lower-class audience; sport, crime, gossip, and politics dominated its columns. The liquor interest always met with sympathy: FitzRoy said the journal most commonly circulated in public houses.⁴⁷ So far as liquor-and-sport invoked a political wind, it blew in favour of the 'Australians'. The tang of *Bell's Life* flavoured such passages as this, claiming to report a group of Sydney larrikins expressing their disgust at one whom they supposed a British prince:

Well, may I lose my wits,
If Tom Sparks would not lick him into fits,
Let Britain now shut up about her seed
If yon's a specimen of her crack breed;
I wouldn't give a lock of Wentworth's hair,
Or Bob's small toe-nail, for a thousand pair. (3 Aug. 1850).

Sparks was a local prize-fighter who had distinguished himself abroad. Few politicians ever rank with such a hero.

Nichols won Northumberland Boroughs in 1848 and soon displayed his allegiance to Wentworth. The young Henry Parkes, then at the far left of the colony's political spectrum, regretted this behaviour from a radical. 'It is to be feared', he wrote, 'that a feeling on account of these gentlemen's Australian birth had more force than public principle.'⁴⁸

James Martin, the son of an Irish (apparently non-convict) publican, was Nichols's protégé. He served his solicitor's articles in the latter's office, and worked for him on the *Australian*. In 1838 Martin published the *Australian Sketch Book*, proudly presented as the first work by one wholly educated in the colony. Appropriately, Sydney College was his school. The *Sketch Book* was dedicated to Nichols, expressed faith in Australia's future, and gave a romantic account of 'the ancient freeholders', settled before and during the hallowed government of Macquarie. Martin wrote for the *Atlas* in the mid-forties, and his name appeared occasionally in other connexions: as Secretary to the Sydney College Council, and organizer of a congratulatory dinner to Wentworth.

Defeated at a by-election early in 1848, Martin stood for Cook-Westmoreland in the general election of that year. The other candidate was Alfred Cheeke, Commissioner of the Court of Requests—that is a Crown employee, and so vulnerable: 'every tax—every imposition—every exaction—every job—every proposal to squander the public money—he must support by his vote'.⁴⁹ Martin presented himself, by contrast, as 'perfectly independent'; further, he falsely claimed Australian nativity. His election was secured, but subsequently declared void because of alleged fabrication of property qualifications. His backers included

Michael Gannon, an emancipist who played an active but largely hidden role in Sydney politics, Robert Fitzgerald, and Samuel Lyons.⁵⁰ Their generosity soon triumphed, for Martin had no opponents in the fresh poll.

Fitzgerald was the son of another successful office-holding ex-convict. He entered the council after a by-election for Cumberland County early in 1849, triumphing over Archibald Michie, who campaigned on a straight anti-transportation programme. The *Herald* vehemently supported Michie; Cowper, Kemp, Charles Campbell, and Lowe sat on his electoral committee. Their opponents? 'Many persons of convict origin or connection are supporting Mr. Fitzgerald', wrote one observer, 'caught, I imagine, by some notion that they are bound to stand by their class.' 'We are charged to vote for Mr. Fitzgerald,' declared another commentator to his brother natives, 'because he is an Australian! This is a bug-bear . . . William Charles Wentworth has been our idol for years! But what has he done?'⁵¹ On nomination day Nichols attacked Michie as the type who would leave the colony once he made his fortune. Wentworth himself played on this theme, while Fitzgerald evoked the grand old days of the crusade against arbitrary government. The 'Australians' spoke equivocally of transportation, becoming reticent of outright support as the campaign progressed. Thus Fitzgerald's slashing victory was hardly a pro-transportation vote: its message was that 'Australianism' still thrived.

The sentiment operated at other elections, not always effectively.⁵² The election for a Sydney seat in 1850 was an important case. The 'Australian' candidate was J. R. Holden—a free migrant, but the 'esquire' on the first corporation and active in the sporting world. His opponent was J. D. Lang, whose campaign was important in the history of orthodox radicalism. One item of Langite propaganda was, however, pertinent to 'Australianism': a 'Programme of Responsible Government (according to Bob Nichols)', which listed a mock cabinet. Wentworth, Fitzgerald, Nichols, Lyons, and their allies all appeared, while the final entry read 'Chief Justice: James Martin'.⁵³

The paragraph was remarkable less for satire than for truth. The writer had detailed Wentworth's party and pointed straight to its objective—government of the colony. In council the 'Australians' did solid, mundane work, Nichols especially helping along many liberal-reformist measures. But their passion was to strike off Imperial fetters. In 1850 Nichols submitted a series of resolutions—passed with some amendment—insisting that the local government have control over public service appointments and that only settled residents should be eligible.⁵⁴ The party attacked the Australian Colonies Government Act, bringing against it all the old animosity to Imperial taxation and control of land, as well as a version of Nichols's patronage scheme.

Yet the 'Australians' simultaneously moved towards alliance with FitzRoy. This might have been part of a long-range scheme to curry

his favour against the coming of responsible government, but there were less hypothetical reasons for sympathy. From early in his term FitzRoy came under criticism for inviting to Government House persons who lacked proper 'respectability': evidently both loose women and emancipists had achieved the guest-list. *Bell's Life* and Fitzgerald's campaign supporters rallied to the Governor's defence. The 'Australians', less-than-absolute rejection of convictism provided further common ground: their leaders, again supported by *Bell's Life*, stood by the Governor during the anti-transportation storms of 1849-50.⁵⁵ At the mayoral election of 1850 the same forces combined to support Hill against Allen and William Thurlow, long a reformist in the corporation. Allegedly, all government employees had instructions to vote for Hill,⁵⁶ who easily topped the poll, but was then found guilty of breaking the electoral laws and so had to make way for Thurlow. During 1850 FitzRoy had dismissed the new mayor from the commission of the peace on trivial grounds, and now refused to recognize his official position.⁵⁷ The peculiar conditions of Sydney politics had welded an alliance between Hill, an utter parvenu, and FitzRoy, the sprig of ancient dukedoms.

So the 'Australians' maintained their fight. Wentworth's final disgust with colonial politics notwithstanding, in 1851 he still had many moments of power and influence before him. Nichols had already reached high cabinet office when he died quite young in 1857: given greater opportunity he might possibly have moulded a more positive 'Australian' outlook. Neither as Premier nor Chief Justice did Martin approach this, but so long as he remained in public life a tradition stretching back to the 1790s was maintained. Time flowed against the 'Australians' but they remained tenacious to the end.

Orthodox Radicalism in New South Wales Politics

Only the oddness of local conditions made political activists out of most gentry, most squatters, and many 'Australians'. A few other individuals were radicals through intellectual conviction—Charles Harpur, the poet; William Clifford, an old soldier of the Napoleonic Wars who expounded his sympathy for the principles of 1789 and detestation for régimes established after 1815; and some atheistic Owenites.⁵⁸ But the radicalism now to be considered owed little to Australia's peculiarities or to altruistic philosophy. Its essential theme was to extend the range of British working-class struggles.

European events then took some three years to react on the colonies, so the years 1835-51 in Australia encompassed influences stemming from the Reform Act to the death-crisis of Chartism. No similar span could offer such drama. Politically-conscious British workingmen helped create the ferment from which emerged the Act of 1832, which turned out far less radical than they had hoped. Their disappointment was

variously expressed. The Poor law of 1834 was assailed for its inhumanity and ruthlessness. Recently freed from the Anti-Combination laws, trade unionism became active and even, as in the attempt to found the Grand National Consolidated Trade Union, chiliastic. Still more important was the development of Chartism. The name covered many movements: political reformism, often associated with faith in self-help and the power of education; 'physical force' revolutionism, blind with anger at current society; agrarian communism; militant Nonconformity, which slashed at established religion. In the early forties the crusade against the Corn laws rose to climax, workingmen having then to decide whether or not to co-operate with the new capitalism in seeking higher standards. Repeal of the laws did not quash the extremists. Rather they carried Chartism on to its final upsurge in the year of Europe-wide revolt, 1848. However vaguely, these events shaped the political sense of all migrants from Britain. In some they would have developed the wish to see a new social system established in Australia.

Several aspects of colonial life promised to help such an ambition. Every obstacle in the conservatives' way had this other side. Above all, labour was scarce, and so the labourer enjoyed more money, freedom, and opportunity than his old-world counterpart. Even before the end of assignment one landowner declared his class to be 'held in a sort of moral slavery' by its employees.⁵⁹ The upper classes indicated an important fact when lamenting that master-servant relationships were reversed. Increased political interest among workers was no necessary result of this situation, but when they did speak, it would be with all the more self-confidence and determination. The facility with which colonial fortunes could be accumulated encouraged radicals in another way: they scorned their wealthy opponents as jumped-up new-rich.⁶⁰

The employers' 'moral slavery' was imposed first by convicts, strong among whom were fraternity, anti-authoritarianism, and sensitivity to injustice. Ex-convicts often continued to act upon these sentiments. Yet, conversely, many felt hostile to 'frees', while others were broken by servitude or supported 'Australianism'. In the event, few ex-convicts appeared among political leaders of the working class. The free migrant was far more prominent.

Even the non-political migrant was likely to demand a high living standard. Self-betterment was his one reason for coming to Australia. All migration literature stressed the country's wealth (*Meat three times a day! ! !*, proclaimed one of Caroline Chisholm's pamphlets⁶¹); some, especially that issued by the Sidney brothers, prepared the common man for struggle with the wealthy. Further, the migrant who failed had reason to direct his resentment against established authority. In these years of the North American boom, the Australian colonies were comparatively unattractive and so the state encouraged migration thither as nowhere else. Official publications avoided gross exaggeration of the colonies' charms, but even the issue of wage-rates seemed to guarantee

employment at such pay being available. This claim against the state could extend to more general political questions—as in the argument that self-government was the right of Britons, wherever they resided.

One contemporary wrote of 'The Emigrant':

when a man removes into such new countries, he seems born again into the world—his possibilities have become great. . . . He learns to speak his opinions boldly upon all matters, and cares not though smoothfaced men call it heresy or treason. . . . He walks to heaven on his own path, and pays no toll.⁶²

These were bold but reasonable generalizations. Simply to endure a hundred-odd days of shipboard life must have increased many migrants' self-confidence. Some would then have made their first contact with formal education, and so would have disembarked better, or at least better-equipped, men. Occasionally, unfair treatment of steerage passengers would rouse them to militancy. One traveller to Australia in the early forties noticed the change wrought in his old servant after a few years' colonial residence: 'self-possessed and more independent; and he can say, "Mornin'"—the usual Australian salutation, with as much *brusquerie* as any American'.⁶³ One wonders if 'James' was now a less amenable servant: the insubordination of emigrant labourers and the difficulty of binding them to agreements caused much bewailing.⁶⁴

Workingmen could seek improvement along several avenues. Some supported self-help institutions;⁶⁵ others joined trade organizations, which pursued industrial as well as benefit society aims. They struck, sought to impose closed-shop rules, helped each other in times of crisis, agitated against the over-employment of apprentices. Compositors defended both their right to combine and a claim for higher wages by reference to British conditions; the handloom weavers of Sydney opposed mechanization; building workers sought a basic wage.⁶⁶ The unions have an important place in the history of Australian labour, and in the background to political action. But the latter remains the core of orthodox radicalism.

Late in 1835 some recent migrants petitioned the Colonial Office, protesting that conditions were much inferior to those promised.⁶⁷ Therefore the government should establish 'thriving farms and neat Cottages' on 'our fertile plains', and encourage general diversification of the economy, including local manufactures. Perhaps many signatories belonged to the Patriotic Association; it early had a distinct left wing, led by Richard Hipkiss, an old Birmingham Political Union man.⁶⁸ This faction achieved little, but by 1840 the political force of the free migrants was strong enough to swing popular opinion against the invidious census clauses. Such at least was the opinion of W. A. Duncan, himself active in this agitation and a warm admirer of the ability and independence of the newcomers.⁶⁹

In the same year Duncan and the trade unions protested against the

more stringent clauses of the current Master and Servant Bill, which was subsequently modified.⁷⁰ A few months later radicals maintained that the anti-dismemberment agitation sprang only from the greed of wealthy men seeking a monopoly of the soil.⁷¹ The workers saw a further threat to their living standards in the legislature's plan, broached late in 1841, to float an immigration loan.⁷² In mid-1842 a proletarian deputation helped persuade Gipps to reduce the municipal franchise to £25.⁷³

Very prominent in these campaigns was Henry Macdermott, mayor in 1845-6. A Protestant Irishman and former schoolteacher, he arrived in Australia as a senior non-commissioned officer and on retirement became a prosperous liquor merchant. Macdermott helped launch the Patriotic Association, opposed Bourke's incorporation scheme, lamented the end of assignment, and in the sharp recession of 1839 fought any discrimination against ex-convicts in the allocation of relief. Duncan, no lenient judge, admired him considerably. Macdermott cultivated many groups—he joined the freemasons, organized an Australia Day dinner, participated in Roman Catholic secular affairs. His advocacy of the underdog's view was probably sincere, but lacked any deep philosophy.⁷⁴ In 1842 he declared his inspiration to be 'a desire that the squirearchy of New South Wales should make no ridiculous comparison between themselves and the landed proprietors of England', and a determination that Australian workers should enjoy the living standards of their British counterparts.⁷⁵ Macdermott scorned any suggestion that he, a veteran soldier, could be rebellious. In fact, he was neither traitor nor fighter for the reconstitution of old-world standards. He represented a new force in politics, bringing together various groups hostile to the respectability. Hence Macarthur's forcing his exclusion from the 1842 petition committee; a stand with which, so Duncan alleged, Wentworth and Bland privately sympathized.⁷⁶

Despite this setback Macdermott remained an important figure. From the outset he was a force on the corporation. He considered standing for the city in the first legislative elections but instead supported Captain M. C. O'Connell, a son of the officer commanding the local forces, grandson of Governor Bligh, native of New South Wales, kinsman and admirer of Ireland's 'Great Liberator'. Macdermott was also allied with another candidate, Robert Cooper, an ex-convict distiller likely to appeal to working-class 'Australians'. It was at a meeting called by Cooper that Macdermott denied the prevalence of any real distress at this time (May 1843):

a few who intended to monopolize the country to themselves . . . found that they had been miscalculating. . . . The poor were becoming rich, while the monopolists were becoming poor, and that was all—and the sooner the revolution was completed the better.⁷⁷

This speech led to the accusation that Macdermott wanted to prolong a current 'run' on the Savings Bank, the origin of which some rumours

attributed to Cooper. Had the two concocted a plan inspired by Francis Place's scheme to organize a 'run' during the Reform campaign of 1832?

Always devoted to the peasant ideal, Macdermott refused to support the pastoralists' outcry of April 1844.⁷⁸ Two months later his name figured at the meeting which discussed the security of Sydney—in fact the convenors aimed their heaviest fire at Macdermott. Soon after came a dispute with Lowe, who in the course of a Council debate impugned Macdermott's character following the latter's alleged blackballing from the Australian Library. Macdermott at once challenged for a duel, but Lowe spurned this action both as coming from a social inferior and as a breach of Council privilege.⁷⁹ The legislature supported the second charge, and Macdermott was brought before the law. Not only did this litigation fail but the issue roused demonstrations in Macdermott's favour: late in 1844 he reached a peak of popularity. Even the legislature now recognized him as a representative figure. He appeared before committees on education and the elective franchise in 1844, and that on Master and Servant legislation in 1845. He sought a greater representation of Sydney in the Council, the encouragement of small farmers by giving them the vote, and preferential rates on spirits distilled from local crops.

Meanwhile fell a heavy blow: narrow defeat at the mayoral election of November 1844. A year later Macdermott won this honour, and the populace applauded; but the tempo of political life had then slowed down. Only in being one of the few public figures to applaud Gipps at his farewell did the mayor hint at important political facts. With a backing of 'seventeen hundred unwashed' he then demonstrated the latent sympathy between executive and the masses *vis-à-vis* the economically powerful classes.⁸⁰ Had Macdermott been a greater man, he might have created an effective alliance from this situation, but when he died soon after concluding his term, he left behind little impress.

An odd remark in Duncan's account of these years suggested one obstacle in his path. Having described the struggles of 1840 the chronicler went on: 'this was about to be succeeded by a violent strife between the elements of aristocracy and democracy, when the monetary crash of 1843-4 interfered, and went far to heal all political distinctions.'⁸¹ Superficially this was nonsense: like all depressions, this one encouraged militance. But Duncan might have meant that sharpening of class consciousness destroyed Macdermott's chance of comprehending in one party a variety of dissidents, from 'Australians' to Chartists. Instead, after 1843 a distinct working-class political movement developed, fated to suffer ups and downs but withal gradually strengthening.

The workers responded to the depression in three major ways. First, they attacked cheap labour. Particularly obnoxious were the employment of convicts in positions that free men might fill, and the pastoralists' renewed plans for introducing coolies. By petitioning that these

projects were 'unjust to those immigrants, who have been induced to leave their Native Country to sojourn in this distant land',⁸² 4,129 signatories demonstrated that the 'immigrant claim' had lost no potency since 1835. It appeared still larger in the second line of attack: that the government had a positive duty to find employment for migrants whom it had brought to the colony. To this end, so the argument ran, public works should be launched and full wages paid. Thirdly, the workers sustained the cry for a yeomanry.⁸³

In August 1843 this feeling crystallized in the formation of the Mutual Protection Association. 'Its political principles', declared one manifesto, 'are those of Constitutional Radicalism, or in other words, those of pure and rational liberty, based on the indefeasible rights of man, and regulated by just views of social expediency and sound policy.'⁸⁴ Any subserviency to 'party spirit' or 'democratic feeling' was repudiated: the Association sought only to check the greed of the pseudo-aristocrats.⁸⁵ More specific aims included the encouragement of colonial manufactures and the return of sound men to the corporation and legislature. Membership reached 500; activity continued for over a year. The Association's newspaper, the *Guardian*, maintained high standards. The first few issues were edited by James McEachern, both before and after this episode a staunch radical; the rest, by Benjamin Sutherland, a cabinet-maker and the movement's most active worker. Apart from holding regular business meetings, the Association ran an employment agency and organized mass expression of its views. One assembly protested against *all* further immigration of labourers, whatever their background.⁸⁶

In both 1843 and 1844 committees of the legislature enquired into the plight of 'distressed labourers'. The incentive in 1843 was the presentation of a petition, organized by the Association and detailing unemployment and poverty. The 'immigrant claim' rang out:

your Petitioners has hoped better things would have fallen to their lot, recollecting the many fair promises and flattering hopes that were held out to many of them, as inducements to leave their native land, and immigrate to this Colony. . . .⁸⁷

The signatories objected to Gipps's niggard provision of public works and to the upper classes' attitude that the unemployed should go into the interior for work. They wanted full employment, on full wages, in Sydney. Various witnesses amplified these themes, Sutherland at their head. J. D. Lang, in the chair, was sympathetic, although most committee members suspected the Association as an illegitimate combination seeking exorbitant wages and political power.

The committee rejected the claim to full, state-subsidized employment, but did suggest some positive action by the government—increase of public works, a special grant to the Benevolent Society, provision of funds to move up-country those willing to go. Sutherland also appeared before the immigration committee of 1843, advocating the protection

of locally-made furniture from American competition.⁸⁸ The 1844 distressed labourers' committee followed, if rather weakly, the same course as the previous year's.⁸⁹ Meanwhile the government had created employment to ease the sharpest poverty and adopted the up-country work proposal, while the Immigration Board acted as an outdoor relief centre. Deas Thomson even said in Council that 'as the people had been brought here . . . it was the duty of the Government to rescue them from destitution'.⁹⁰ The workers' voice had sounded to effect.

Superficially the Association's major victory lay in its association with the City Council. Its membership included six councillors elected in 1843, and it endorsed others.⁹¹ The *Guardian* sympathized with the corporation against the legislature during the police controversy of mid-1844, supported its wish for a £10 franchise, and scorned the six-months' rent franchise limitation. Wentworth rebuked the Association's presumption in summoning City councillors to give an account of their actions, while Bland spoke of 'pestilent demagogue influence'.⁹² This connexion between Association and corporation warns against absolute separation of 'Australianism' and orthodoxy; on the other hand, councillor Hollinshed's efforts to unite migrant and ex-convict radicals came to nothing.⁹³

As soon as economic pressures lifted the Association collapsed, its end hastened by various divisions of opinion. Most important was whether or not to support Gipps against the squatters, which involved the priority of winning self-government as against pulling down the colonial aristocracy.⁹⁴ Meanwhile Macdermott and even Wentworth continued to draw off radical feeling. No evidence shows which men chose which standpoint, but undoubtedly no single organization could yet enjoy stability. The Association explained its weakness by reference to 'the varied and individualized nature of employment in this city', 'reluctance on the part of the people to associate', and 'the apathy which has grown up amongst the humbler classes in the colony, out of the protracted political subserviency into which they have been plunged'.⁹⁵

From 1845 to 1847 radical ideas survived only in a few transient journals: the *Age*, the *Citizen*, and the *Star and Working Man's Guardian*, editorials of which also appeared in the *Parramatta Chronicle*. The *Star* professed to illuminate the way towards 'an ultimate revolution in the whole system of political economy'.⁹⁶ The editor was always sensitive to class legislation, and became increasingly bitter against the selfishness of wealthy men. 'Vampire capitalists' always combined together, he wrote in mid-1845; workers must do likewise, and use their power to wring concessions from whichever of the legislature's parties—executive or opposition—sought their aid. The *Star* scorned the 'respectability'; supported a £10 legislative franchise; and urged the government to exploit sugar, flax, minerals, and other such products.⁹⁷ The sole mass movement in those years answered the threat of renewed transportation: late in 1846, 6,600 persons petitioned the

Crown, reviving all the traditional arguments against cheap labour. They noted the unhappy position of those migrants who had left Britain only because 'the Stain, which this Colony had previously been labouring under, was gradually being removed'.⁹⁸

The year 1848 glorified Australian, as well as European, democracy. From mid-July the leading journals carried an advertisement advocating the return of Robert Lowe for Sydney in the forthcoming general election. The signatories, on behalf of a committee, were J. R. Wilshire, the second mayor, J. K. Heydon, an ex-convict, Roman Catholic tradesman, and Henry Parkes, making his political début. Lowe's appeal to working-class radicals was manifold: he had brilliantly opposed the squatters' land monopoly, Boyd's importation of Pacific islanders, and convict transportation. Parkes, writing in long retrospect, stressed this last factor and the hostility of free migrants to any resumption.⁹⁹ Himself the incarnation of migrant assertiveness, Parkes made clear that this force gave Lowe his strongest support. Probably a connexion lay between the renaissance of political interest and the increased tempo of free migration at this time. The newcomers would have borne no grudge against Lowe as Macdermott's old enemy; if they knew of that episode at all, it would probably have been to suspect Macdermott, with his interest in liquor and transportation, as having been too close to 'Australianism'. Yet some continuity remained. Parkes was intimate with Duncan, Macdermott's admirer; and was to revere E. S. Hall, an upholder of the liberal-emancipist cause since 1811, as his first mentor in colonial politics.¹

Lowe's propaganda stressed his devotion to great liberal principles—general education, government economy, wider franchise, clean electoral practices. Above all, he proclaimed his freedom from factional bias: one significance of this campaign was that Lowe, a spokesman of high British liberalism, professed to see the working class as guardians of liberty and the public good.² But Lowe was to deplore the need to 'inflamm the minds of the masses' against Imperial control and in the sixties to attack the extension of the franchise to the British proletariat, lest it create mob tyranny. Perhaps these attitudes derived from late in 1848, when he refused to support a working-class demand for the expansion of public works to combat unemployment; speakers at a mass meeting therefore abused him, asserting that 'their' member should do as they wished.³ Here was precisely the factional animus which liberalism detested.

Such considerations did not appear important at the time. Lowe's victory—he finished behind Wentworth but ahead of Bland and John Lamb—carried his supporters to ecstasy. 'That was a day when public virtue sprung up', wrote Henry Parkes a few months later; 'that was the birth-day of Australian Democracy.'⁴ Before 1848 closed, the infant made two notable advances.

On 2 December appeared the first issue of the *People's Advocate*, for

six years to advocate Chartist-type radicalism under a motto from Alphonse de Lamartine:

Political economy has hitherto occupied itself about the production of wealth. It must now occupy itself about the distribution of wealth; so that the labourer may no longer be left without his fair share of the produce.

The *Advocate's* editor was E. J. Hawksley, formerly a Roman Catholic schoolteacher and publicist and the man who tackled James Macarthur concerning natural rights. Hawksley accepted John Locke's theory of civil government, and so argued that the people had a right to rebel against a tyrannous government—power lay where they determined. He proclaimed the role of 'party' action in politics, albeit suggesting that universal suffrage might remove its necessity. The *Advocate* frequently criticized the 'Australians'—indeed it documented much of their history. 'Even Sparta had its unworthy sons', remarked one editorial, while Wentworth was dubbed 'the infamous Australian'. In his constant efforts to incite the workers to action, Hawksley became confused in a most interesting way. While denying that colonial labourers had no substantial grievances, he also maintained that because the common man was more affluent in Australia his claim to citizenship had greater weight. The *Advocate* supported voluntarism in religion, lauded education, and scrutinized public administration. Hawksley wrote most editorials, but for about a year received assistance from Parkes.⁵

The last radical achievement of 1848 was the establishment of the Constitutional Association, a political union which aimed at an extended franchise, redistribution of electorates on a population basis, greater responsibility of government, and a land policy designed to encourage agriculture.⁶ The ideal of uniting all classes received due homage, but antipathy to the colony's 'Lordly Landed Interest' played a more immediate part in the Association's philosophy. Hawksley, Parkes, Hipkiss, Sutherland, and Heydon were members. The Association's great triumph was to organize the anti-transportation outbursts of June 1849: ward meetings of 'citizens', mass petitions, physical force. The many commentators, including Earl Grey, FitzRoy, and *Bell's Life*, who attributed the demonstrations to political ambition, were not altogether wrong. Even E. S. Hall wrote to the Colonial Office apropos 'the turbulent spirit, which *now* governs the immigrant mob of Sydney', depicting Lowe as a revolutionary leader of Chartist desperadoes.⁷

Meanwhile the Association had agitated for the reduction of the legislative franchise to £10, and supported Michie in his election campaign against Fitzgerald. Later in 1849 it urged that the corporation's weaknesses should be remedied by reducing the municipal franchise at least to the British level. Its final fling was to campaign for J. R. Wilshire when Lowe's resignation entailed another poll in Sydney (late 1849). William Bland won a very dull election made notable only by the

speech of a third candidate, Adam Bogue, at the declaration. Wilshire's defeat, according to Bogue, revealed

that no gentleman, however competent and eligible to become a candidate, who had been put forward by a secret society, whose best exertions were used for the propagation of communist and socialist principles, could hope to succeed.⁸

Parkes stood up, and denied that he was a communist.

The drabness of this poll contrasted with the excitement following Bland's resignation in mid-1850. Again Parkes organized the radicals, whose new champion was J. D. Lang—veteran anti-emancipist, sympathizer with the underdog throughout his earlier term on Council (1843-7), and admirer of American democracy. Lang had just returned from a long sojourn in Britain, during which he had clashed with the Colonial Office on many issues. The immediate prelude to his candidature was the presentation of two lectures in Sydney on 'The Coming Event'—namely, the complete break of the Australian colonies from Britain and the establishment of a new era of social justice. The land monopoly, transportation, Imperial patronage—all would disappear, and the spirit of nationalism produce the same glorious effects in the Antipodes as in Europe. Parkes, Michie, Wilshire and many others helped Lang begin the Australian League, dedicated to these aims. The League itself never became important, but such propaganda, spiced with a class-consciousness which made some sense of renewed charges of communistic extremism, carried Lang to narrow but glorious victory over Holden.⁹ Orthodox radicalism had vanquished 'Australianism' in open combat. Yet among Lang's warmest congratulators was M. W. Henry, foe of the respectability for fifty years.¹⁰ His letter symbolized Lang's achievement in bringing together, and to triumph, the strongest elements of Australian democracy. The radicals, probably through stressing anti-transportation, also won to their side a strong mercantile interest, which had earlier considered nominating Robert Campbell II.

As two years earlier, electoral victory set off a salvo of energetic actions. Parkes organized further anti-transportation demonstrations in August-September 1850, while other Langites defended their hero against the legislature's criticism of his immigration project at Moreton Bay.¹¹ Hawksley and others were active in the election of City councillors at the end of the year, while Parkes supported George Allen for mayor. Late in 1850 Parkes launched the *Empire* newspaper, just before Lang commenced another far less important journal, the *Press*. These combined with the *Advocate* to upbraid their opponents—Hill, FitzRoy, Wentworth, the 'Australians' generally. In answer to Wentworth's taunts the *Empire* even featured 'Songs of the Socialists'. Early in 1851 Hawksley announced the New South Wales Political Association, very similar to the Constitutional Association save in lacking Parkes's support.¹² The new group helped Lang to head the first poll for Sydney under the

£10 franchise. Meanwhile the gold discoveries had burst upon the colony. Radicals at once saw the event as a decisive help, just when the re-distribution of legislative seats had threatened conservative dominance. 'The moment has arrived', exulted Hawksley, 'for a great moral revolution'.¹³ His confidence was reasonable, but the past fifteen years had seen a more profound change in Australian radicalism than did the immediate future.

There was little ferment outside Sydney. Transportation schemes alone provoked much reaction in Melbourne, although the workers' discussion on how to celebrate Port Phillip's separation was interesting: one party wanted a new self-help institution, another the total abolition of assisted migration.¹⁴ A working-class newspaper (the *Standard*, 1845) lasted only a few issues, as did the similar *Victoria Courier* in Geelong (1849). At Brisbane a Mr Langridge, skilled in putting the 'immigrant claim', tried to assert himself as a radical leader; he and his fellows were very anxious lest the northern district be separated from New South Wales and left to the labour-hungry squatters.¹⁵

Hostility to up-country work expressed the immigrant's psychology. His search for a higher living standard led to the urban fleshpots. Thus the government could spend only £120 of the £1000 set aside in 1843-4 for taking unemployed up-country, whereas coincident expansion of public works pulled many workers back to the metropolis.¹⁶ This concentration in Sydney had the remarkable effect of making British radical ideas more or less appropriate to a very different economic environment: the Australian bush was not a safety valve for democratic notions because, unable to become yeomen, most democrats refused to go there.

By contrast, many workers were avid to seek out satisfactory employment. The restless habits of the lower orders frequently evoked complaints from employers and reproof from other observers. They went to China, to Chile, to the goldfields of California; altogether 2,434 persons left Sydney for the last destination in fifteen months from January 1849.¹⁷ Even those workingmen who did go to the bush found, not reason to forget democratic ideas, but an environment which in its own way strengthened equality and unity.

Solidarity could be strong without formal organization. An employment agent remarked that men often refused to take wages below a certain level 'through a fear of making themselves disagreeable to fellow workers'.¹⁸ Unionists who did so would be 'marked men', but the feeling prevailed among all grades and conditions. Similarly, Caroline Chisholm warned against *large* parties being sent up-country. Before their fellows, men refused wages offensive to their pride; isolated, they would accept their wives' advice, and submit.¹⁹ Occasionally the mob took direct action: it barracked James Mudie, a particularly brutal master, in court; pursued the secretary of the coolies' employment association through the streets; supported a mutiny among the troops, angered by losing

their rum ration; in the year of Europe's revolutions, stormed a guard-house and released a boy taken in charge for setting off fire-crackers; and at the height of anti-transportation feeling, threw stones at FitzRoy.²⁰ The strangest episode came late in 1843, when one C. R. Hyndman, politician and lunatic, claimed that he had such power over Sydney's Cabbage-Tree Hat Mob that on his word 7,000 men would rise and overthrow the Governor.²¹

In Australia as elsewhere tightening intimacy between political representatives and their supporters was largely the work of the left, and added most to its power. Windeyer first broke with tradition, professing to vote only as the majority of his constituents desired: the *Herald* wept, but the electorate applauded.²² City councillor Thomas Smidmore went further when he publicly apologized for having mistakenly voted against Macdermott in the 1844 mayoral contest.²³ The Mutual Protection Association's connexion with the corporation and the proprietary claims of Lowe's supporters also strengthened and illuminated the trend. Parkes's and Hawksley's advent began a new episode in this story. The former was to achieve power through such arts, but Hawksley was even quicker to see them as an aid to democracy.

Tasmanian Counterparts

In Tasmania there were many ex-convicts; commentators who deplored both the irreverence of native youth and the 'leveling principle' induced by convict behaviour; trade societies which upheld union principles.²⁴ West, generalizing from his observations in the island, argued that the migration of the free workman

revolutionised the state of the colonies. . . . If his industry raised him, he yet retained the sympathies of his early life: he remained distrustful of the rich, jealous of rank, and fond of the equality of human rights. Trial by jury, legislative assemblies, and official responsibility, found earnest advocates, where [previously] they had often been mere rallying points of personal discontent. All this was foreseen by Arthur: when free laborers were intruded by the crown, the great bond of his system was broken.²⁵

Yet these ingredients of radicalism never formed a potent mixture in the smaller colony, largely because opportunities for economic advancement were scarcer. No ex-convicts rose to the eminence of Lyons or Terry, few to that of Nichols's father, or Fitzgerald's. Many workers sought improvement by going to the mainland, instead of becoming politically active. Moreover, Tasmanian history included no figure comparable to Macquarie. The gentry alone might feel that the colony was 'theirs by right'; the real birth of the colony was in the twenties, with Bigge its midwife. The settlers responded to this situation, taking the initiative in every field. That they did so in politics, not hesitating to adopt a radical stand when necessary, still further constricted other groups.

Consequently only two interesting episodes distinguished the history of the Tasmanian have-nots. The first centred on the workers' action against transportation, which in Tasmania put probation convicts into direct competition on the labour market. The depression of 1844-5 impelled a protest to Eardley-Wilmot against the employment of such men and the organization of a Free Labour Union to pursue this campaign.²⁶ Times improved and the movement fizzled until anti-transportation feeling revived in 1847. In April a proletarian assembly appointed William Jeffrey 'as a delegate of the working classes to attend the meeting of the influential gentlemen'.²⁷ Jeffrey went along, and also many of his peers, who loudly expressed their feelings. Fresh life pervaded the Labour Union, which strove to establish employer-employee co-operation to reserve the labour market for free men.²⁸

The plan did not work well, but two years later a Free Tradesmen's Association with similar aims began at Launceston. At this time anti-transportation employers were contemplating a boycott on probation labourers; the Association sought to drive this principle home, wanting consumers to boycott any transgressor. It urged moreover that such ostracism should extend to all who encouraged 'the importation of British manufactured goods that can be manufactured in the colony'.²⁹ This was visionary, but some employers did apply the labour boycott, and the Launceston group thus became a model for Hobartians. The Labour Union rose again, under the title 'Hobart Town Trade Union'.³⁰ It planned to blacklist employers of probation labour, to start an employment agency, and to practise 'a system of passive resistance' against continued transportation. Jeffrey and two other operatives, John Williams (Hobart) and John Denney (Launceston), served on the 'influential' anti-transportation committees from August-September 1850. At this time, too, Williams exhorted his comrades to interest themselves in politics, and so ensure the return of sound men to the first elected legislature.³¹ Two candidates, Robert Pitcairn, a lawyer, and T. D. Chapman, a merchant, both leading anti-transportationists, evidently received the Union's blessing. Jeffrey certainly used his influence to help Chapman, who topped the Hobart poll.³² Pitcairn did not stand, but John Dunn, the second man returned, was of similar stamp. Common antipathy to convicts had dampened class conflict.

From 1846 the unionists received some support from the newspaper, *Britannia and Trades' Advocate*, edited by John Morgan. He reported the Union's proceedings in some detail, called for the establishment of a Reform Association, and warned Denison that his mis-government was making democrats out of loyal Tasmanians.³³ Otherwise the *Britannia's* silence argued that trades' advocacy had little scope or popular appeal.

By contrast, the second episode—concerning the island's 'Australian' counterpart—centred almost wholly on a journal, the *Hobarton Guardian*, founded in May 1847. Its editor was William Bailey, an Anglican deacon and pedagogue transported for financial malpractice.³⁴ Early issues

attacked the anti-transportation campaign, arguing that cessation would damage the economy to the injury of the free worker and everyone else. Bailey also deplored the inhumanity of those who would cast out the convict; and scorned 'the silly toys of all *self-government*', with which so many colonists amused themselves. The colony had most to hope from 'an enlightened Executive, patriotically guided, and salutarily controlled, by public sentiment, conveyed through an independent *unhired press*'.³⁵ How inverted had Tasmanian politics become! In order to challenge the dominant class, this theorist of Tasmania's 'new men' aligned himself with the most conservative of all administrators. The *Hobartton Guardian*'s proprietor, John Moore, hesitated to follow this tortuous path. He quarrelled with Bailey, and the journal switched from 'Australian' to orthodox radicalism: Denison and various aspects of the public administration came under sharp criticism; the local magistrates' court was accused of bias against the poor; the *People's Advocate* was welcomed as a kindred spirit. Early in 1849 the *Hobartton Guardian* even opposed transportation.

In September, however, T. G. Gregson persuaded the legislature to resolve against the employment of ex-convicts as government school-teachers. At once Bailey published an address calling upon emancipists to answer vigorously this threat of slavery. 'And to whom are you thus to submit', demanded the writer, '—by whom are you to be thus swindled and disfranchised—mark it, by men, who by your sweat and heart's blood reared princely fortunes.'³⁶ The new year saw the launching of the oddly-styled 'Society for the Propagation of the Charities, &c. of the Gospel', which abused the anti-transportationists and lauded Denison.³⁷ The society misfired, but reappeared in October as the Prisoners' Protection Society, soon renamed the Tasmanian Union. The *Hobartton Guardian* supported these moves, and became official organ of the Union. Bailey's name did not appear on the committee of the organization, but probably he inspired much of its activity.

The Union's basic aim was to secure impartial treatment for ex-convicts. The granting of hotel licences, appointment to the public service, and election to the magistracy appeared areas of likely discrimination. The Union claimed the purpose of combining 'all the hitherto dissevered elements of our social system . . . into *one* compact body . . . immoveable, controlling and irresistible'.³⁸ Bailey's wife applauded:

In moral power proceed—may Heaven your Union bless!
And grant your virtuous efforts safe and sure success.³⁹

Members were very conscious of the impending elections, but for which the Union might never have existed. As early as June 1850 the *Hobartton Guardian* urged Hobart's emancipists to support William Carter, a wealthy immigrant merchant prominent in the Union. Later, two other leading members appeared as possible candidates—William Watchorn,

of similar background to Carter, and Edward Howe, probably an ex-convict. All three had some connexion with the rudimentary municipal organization set up in Hobart in 1846-7; Carter was to become first mayor in 1853 and Watchorn a pioneer alderman.

The Union doubtless accepted Bailey's argument that its chief enemy was the Anti-Transportation League—devoted, he said, to creating class feeling and manipulating it to political effect.⁴⁰ Positively, the Union advocated free institutions, development of local resources and manufactures, the abolition of differential duties, and improved education.⁴¹ It denied any hankering after transportation. Opponents of the Union alleged that it was the executive's pawn and that Denison hoped to strengthen his government with the support of any legislators whom it might elect.⁴² Gregson probably referred to the Union when he told Boyes that he regretted the imminence of self-government now that the convict influence had grown so potent.⁴³ Morgan, Jeffrey, and the Trades Union were also among its enemies: the comparison with the *Empire-Advocate*-Lang opposition to the FitzRoy-'Australian'-*Bell's Life* alliance was very close. Yet at this decisive moment the Tasmanians failed to rally wide support. Well before election day the Union had passed into oblivion, poisoned by the taint of connexion with Denison and transportation. Carter, Howe, and Watchorn did not even nominate. Bailey switched to support Thomas Young, a pro-transportationist who suffered heavy defeat.

Puny though they were, these movements revealed that throughout eastern Australia both penalism and capitalism—one distinctly local, one inherited from Britain—contributed to social stress. Convictism and its aftermath, democracy, and socialism all appeared to conservatives as fearful and ever-present dangers. Comments to this effect often exaggerated, but did not invent. These elements did exist, and would somehow have to be contained.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS MEMBERS

The Encouragement of Radicalism and Liberalism

THE RELATION between liberalism and the Catholic Church was a fascinating and important aspect of nineteenth-century history. Repeatedly, individuals and movements sought to modify the Church's teachings in accord with Enlightenment principles. The new world gave impetus to this drive; thus Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* urged the European Church to adapt itself as (he said) American experience showed it must, if social change was not to deprive it of all influence. Repeatedly, Popes and Church Councils denounced would-be reformers as heretics, and asserted the evil falsity of liberalism. So in 1832 and 1834 Gregory XVI repudiated Abbé R. H. de Lammenais, who had brilliantly expounded enlightened Catholicism. Yet liberal forces rallied, and in 1846 appeared to have won a victory with the election of G. M. Mastai-Ferretti as Pope Pius IX. His early months in office saw changes in the Church's temporal and even spiritual organization. This encouraged Italian liberals and nationalists to hope that the Pontiff would help emancipate their country from Austrian rule and even support the creation of a secular nation state. Put to the test in 1848-9, these hopes collapsed; Pius fled from Rome as Garibaldi's rebels took control of the city. Thereafter the Pope became a vehement enemy of Catholic liberalism, although he never quashed it entirely.

The reformers claimed that, if true to itself, the Church must uphold radicalism. Thinkers so diverse as Novalis and de Tocqueville believed that democracy harmonized with Catholic more than any other theology. Churchmen interested in social justice, whether liberals or not, invoked religious principles to their cause. These trends were universal.

More immediate and potent factors linked left-wing politics and Australian Catholics, the overwhelming majority of whom were Irish by birth or descent. Their old-world memories conduced not only to hatred of English government but to distrust of all secular authority. The *Herald's* pun on Irish loyalty, 'Pat-riot-ism', had a sharp point. Catholic spokesmen could and did evoke old antipathies to bolster up their policies: by denigrating the National system of education as that forced upon Ireland by her foreign rulers or by gibing at *laissez faire* as a doctrine all very well for England but not necessarily so for everyone else. This

rejection of English ways probably explained why Catholics fostered Australian national sentiment. One piece of evidence of this was that as early as August 1845 the Church paper in Sydney, the *Chronicle*, anticipated Nichols's demand that government positions be reserved for local men.

So clearly were Ireland's wrongs remembered that, at least in Sydney and Parramatta, branches of the Association for Repeal of the Union arose. 'The magic voice which roused the active sympathy of thousands in America, has found its way to the distant shores of Australia', declared the Sydney Repealers, inviting all friends of civil liberty to join their 'glorious and constitutional struggle'.¹ The movement always attracted interest among the Austral-Irish. One public meeting protested against Catholic jurors being excluded from the state trials of the nationalist leaders in 1844; Daniel O'Connell's release a few months later caused J. B. Polding, episcopal leader of Australian Catholics from 1834, to make a speech after Sunday evening service which hailed Repeal as a movement 'of justice, of morality, of religion, and of God'.² At this time Repealers began a newspaper which advocated both O'Connell's cause and the radical interest in New South Wales politics.³ Two more successful journals directed by Irish Catholics—*Freeman's Journal*, started late in 1850 by the Reverend John McEncroe, a man of vast influence, and *Irish Exile and Freedom's Advocate*, the work of Patrick O'Donohoe, one of six nationalists transported to Tasmania for complicity in the rising of 1848—invoked memories of Ireland and the principles of liberty. O'Donohoe and his fellow rebels had a rapturous welcome from the island's Catholic population; like the ever-revered United Irishmen of 1798, they embodied the antipathy between Catholicism and English rule.

Australian Catholics were largely of humble social class. Far more of them than any other practising Christians came out as convicts. The Church made no distinction between free and bond either before the communion table or at secular meetings. Most leading laymen were emancipists. When Judge Burton sneered at this, W. B. Ullathorne, Vicar-General of New South Wales from 1832 to 1841, answered: 'to hold men down in degradation whom no law degrades—is this the way to raise them up? Is this mercy?'⁴ Generally, Austral-Irish were unschooled and unskilled, and therefore disposed towards 'have-not' politics.

A third factor shaping Catholic attitudes was the favour which liberal philosophy had recently bestowed upon the Church in Britain. Thence came the Emancipation of 1829; thence, O'Connell and many others hoped, would come Repeal. The same influence had affected colonial matters; before Emancipation, official posts would not have gone to Catholic laymen Roger Therry (Commissioner of the Court of Requests, 1829; Supreme Court Judge at Melbourne, 1845) and J. H. Plunkett (Solicitor-General, 1832; Attorney-General, 1836). Neither would a man so sympathetic to the Catholic interest as was Bourke have become

Governor of New South Wales; nor the Church Acts, British law. Many colonial liberals remained sympathetic to Catholicism, especially in its struggle against Anglican ascendancy.

The Catholic influence in politics began with its support of Bourke. The conservatives' attack on Therry aimed true, for he was high among the Governor's friends and advisers. Both were related to Edmund Burke and shared his beliefs. Before coming to Australia Therry had edited the speeches of Canning; his library included Grattan, Huskisson, and Romilly. Another Catholic layman who upheld Bourke's policies was Dr John Lhotsky, an eccentric but able jack-of-all-sciences. Polding, too, supported Bourke. He feared and detested the 'cold self-calculating Scotch Tory Officials'⁵ against whom the Governor struggled. Nor had the Bishop any sympathy for gentry pretensions. 'The convict system is creating amongst us the aristocracy of wealth, the worst of all tyrannies', he wrote, welcoming the end of assignment as a blow to the landowning class.⁶ In 1837 Bourke left Australia, farewelled by the Catholic clergy with a fulsome address. His memory flourished: Roger Therry organized the erection of the statue which still graces Sydney's domain; and Irishmen abounded at its unveiling on 11 April 1842.

The *Chronicle*, begun in 1839 under the editorship of W. A. Duncan, held firmly leftward. Duncan was a remarkable man—a bibliophile, musicologist, and liberal thinker. Under his direction the *Chronicle* ardently criticized the gentry. In their ill-treatment of convicts lay 'the grand cause of . . . bush-ranging, and of the *sympathy* by which the bush-rangers are protected and enabled to exist'; in their ill-treatment of emancipists, the impulse to any factional bitterness in that quarter; in their ill-treatment of workers, an attempt to deny the common right to 'comfortable independence'.⁷ Duncan's detestation of the gentry led him to support both 'Australian' and 'orthodox' radicalism. On every major issue—census schedule, corporation exclusion, Master and Servant Bill, coolie schemes, proposed immigration loan—he presented the underdog's case. The results were alliance with Macdermott and increasing alienation from the Church's traditional friends among more moderate reformers, such as Wentworth and Bland. The proceedings of the 1842 petition committee, whence Macdermott had so firmly been excluded, found little favour in the *Chronicle*. Meanwhile Macdermott himself pursued Catholic favour—supporting the St Patrick's Society, for instance, and a presentation to a uniquely popular priest, J. J. Therry. Probably most demonstrations in Macdermott's favour came from Irishmen.

Polding, too, was Duncan's friend and ally. He wrote occasionally for the early *Chronicle*, taking a firm political stand. Thus in 1839 he regretted Gipps's appointment of P. P. King to the Legislative Council 'when he had the opportunity of placing a liberal mind, a Wentworth for instance, amid that mass of dull obstructiveness'.⁸ Polding, with Ullathorne, encouraged Duncan's fight against the invidious census question. He urged the establishment of self-government, and later told Duncan

that his sole criticism of the 1842 Constitution was that the franchise stood twice too high.⁹ On all these points, and also at the personal level, the Catholic interest was close to the Patriotic Association.

Duncan's radicalism finally lost him his job with the *Chronicle*. Most of the journal's financial backers opposed Gipps's incorporation Act because it threatened their pockets. Duncan, by contrast, praised the legislation as a step towards local responsibility. Now Wentworth, notably influential among the Catholics, massed feeling against him. The rift deepened when Duncan criticized the Roger Therry-Macarthur-Wentworth alliance at the 1843 election. Francis Murphy, Ullathorne's successor as Vicar-General until 1844 and currently in charge of the diocese during Polding's absence in Europe, accused Duncan of creating dissension, and supported his deposition from the editorial chair early in 1843. Duncan appealed to Polding on the latter's return some weeks later, and believed that he had the sympathy of both the Bishop and the rank and file. But he was not reinstated.

In the 1843 election Duncan worked for Captain O'Connell, whose liberal-Anglican beliefs and association with the great Daniel won him many Catholic votes. Duncan no doubt hoped to spike Wentworth's guns, and believed that O'Connell's politics were close to his own. In fact, the Captain's platform was no more radical than Wentworth's or even Roger Therry's, which rested on defence of the Church Act. But this was enough to make Therry's victory a triumph for both liberalism and the Church: eight years later he claimed still that his defeat might have encouraged the legislature to overturn multi-establishment.¹⁰ Edward Curr (Melbourne) and Robert Fitzgerald (Cumberland boroughs) were other candidates who rode the Catholic-liberal alliance; like O'Connell, they lost.

Duncan continued an influential Catholic, for in mid-1843 he began an independent journal, the *Weekly Register*. Early issues continued to harass the upper classes, whose unity *vis-à-vis* the government drove Duncan to modify his theoretical rejection of all factional activity in politics:

the greatest danger we opine that could befall the Colony, would be this total inattention to the views of parties. Unanimity is a good thing in its way, but let this unanimity prevail in the Council for twelve months, let the people shut their eyes in obedience to the *Herald's* advice during that period, and when they open them they will, in all probability, find a suit of very well-contrived fetters fitted to their ancles. An assembly without parties cannot be made out of human materials (5 Aug. 1843).

As a radical it embarrassed him to say so, remarked Duncan subsequently, but the executive had proved itself more liberal and conscious of the public good than had local representatives. Meanwhile, Duncan kept up his erstwhile causes. He supported Macdermott in the privilege dispute with Lowe and browbeat the legislators for refusing to extend self-government through district councils. For this he won the approval of

James Macarthur, with whom, once the incarnation of all he most disliked, Duncan soon had further common ground—detestation of the squatter interest. The struggle of 1844 appeared to him as ‘a contest between the public and a few half-ruined monopolists—between justice and injustice, and between morality and vice’.¹¹

While attacking first the gentry and then the squatters, Duncan praised the ideal of a closely-settled agricultural community. Editorials on this subject were reprinted in two pamphlets, *On Self-supporting Agricultural Working Unions* and *A Practical Treatise on the Culture of the Olive Tree*. Another theme of the *Weekly Register* was abuse of Wentworth, whose leadership of the squatters deepened Duncan’s long-standing hostility. In one of his many contributions, Charles Harpur asked ‘Is Wentworth a Patriot?’, and answered

However loud he bawl
About his country, ’twere as fit to call
Maize dumpling gold, because forsooth—’tis yellow.

Although never enthusiastic for labour unions, and later a critic of democracy, Duncan sympathized with the working-class protest against the depression. Once more he abandoned theory when arguing for the relief of distress. ‘Wages,’ he wrote, ‘. . . ought, in a sound state of things to be regulated by the supply and the demand. But . . . in this case, we do not enjoy a sound state of things.’¹² Had the *Weekly Register* continued, it would doubtless have spoken wisely about the radicalism of later years. But at the end of 1845 financial pressure forced Duncan to become a customs officer at Brisbane.

Meanwhile the *Chronicle*, edited by McEncroe until November 1843 and for the next three years by his nephew Michael D’Arcy, had followed a policy equally radical. These men were still quicker than Duncan to repudiate *laissez faire*. Thus the new *Chronicle* freely demanded government action on behalf of working people, whom D’Arcy lauded as ‘the great producers of everything useful, agreeable, and beautiful’.¹³ He wanted protection for the corn-grower, and for such trades as carpentry. The government, moreover, should establish a state bank to issue credit and discount small bills, and should relieve the poor with loans from an official *mont-de-piété*. D’Arcy denied that education alone would eliminate all wrongdoing. Not mere ignorance, but ‘ages of misrule and oppression, producing poverty, degradation, and baseness of spirit among the people! these are what cause crime’.¹⁴

Like the *Weekly Register*, the *Chronicle* glorified small farming and belittled the Pastoral Association. D’Arcy feared lest the grant of an elective Council had been premature, giving power to men heedless of the public good; local politics must find regeneration in ‘a lofty, manly, wholesome democratic spirit’.¹⁵ On Gipps’s departure from Sydney the *Chronicle* described his administration more fulsomely than did any other journal.

Now practical politics re-entered the story, for Murphy's successor as Vicar-General, H. G. Gregory, organized a farewell testimonial to Gipps: once again Macdermott and the Church walked together. Orange propaganda suggested that the alliance had prevailed within the Sydney City Council, allegedly dominated by a 'papal-democratic mob'.¹⁶ Certainly, many Councillors bore Irish names. More evident links bound Catholicism and the post-1848 'Australian' party in the legislature. Fitzgerald was sympathetic to the Church; Martin still nominally faithful; Nichols a convert of the future; Wentworth himself an old friend. Throughout their history 'Australians' had a temperamental affinity with the Catholic interest, and probably thence drew much electoral power.

Catholics also helped the orthodox radicalism of the late forties, as Heydon and Hawksley illustrated. The latter worked on the *Chronicle* for eighteen months preceding its closure in September 1848, and helped carry it towards a Chartist position. Co-editor for most of this time was Charles St Julian, also a Catholic and a radical. Many readers of the *People's Advocate* were his co-religionists. One contemporary pointed to a remarkable feature of Lang's election in 1850: the support this militant anti-Papist received from Irish Catholics. The explanation offered was that the democracy of these voters waxed so violent that it swamped religious sentiment.¹⁷ This probably had some truth, although Lang's advocacy of Irish Repeal no doubt helped him. Not that all Catholic politicians supported Lang in 1850—Heydon and Edward McEncroe, the priest's brother, joined his opponents.

John McEncroe had not left the radical camp, however. He supported the anti-transportation movement, endorsing working-class arguments with such warmth that Lang later declared the priest, not himself, to have been Australia's first republican. The *Freeman's Journal* maintained the hostility to squatting: as a mere 'accidental pursuit' this deserved no voice in the legislature, even though the 'representation of interests' concept was sound.¹⁸ The journal pressed for the £10 franchise, as McEncroe believed that oligarchy rather than democracy was likely to provoke communist excess. These policies won support from other notable Catholics: Caroline Chisholm, ever an advocate of small farming and after 1850 the squatters' declared enemy; and Vicar-General Gregory. Writing to Rome of the 1851 Constitution Gregory remarked:

the Bill recently granted by the Imperial Parliament, for a new arrangement of the Legislature in the Colony, will also, it is probable, be serviceable to the cause of Catholicism, inasmuch as by the extension of the voting franchise, the influence of the labouring and trading classes will be rendered more able to cope with that of the wealthy landholders and capitalists who are almost exclusively Protestants.¹⁹

By instinct and background Gregory was a thorough conservative. That he could adopt the language of democracy showed how strong were the pressures driving the Church to the political left.

Tasmanian Catholics associated with the local 'Australian' faction. John Moore, proprietor of the *Hobarton Guardian*, belonged to the Church, and his journal showed sympathetic interest in its affairs, especially during the Papal crisis of 1848-9. J. J. Therry, then serving in Hobart, sat on the committee of the Tasmanian Union, having first made clear his opposition to transportation. The *Irish Exile* held much the same views as the *Hobarton Guardian*, scorning those who would 'stigmatize the bondsman with criminality' and the gentry as 'a class, in every sense wholly alien and bitterly hostile to the population'. O'Donohoe saw nothing terrible in continued transportation or the alleged Denison-Union link.²⁰

He advocated orthodox radicalism too. Workingmen should elect one of themselves to the legislature, and so challenge the rapacious gentry:

when the making and administering of the laws are the privilege of a few, and when the great body of the people lie legally at the mercy of those few, the laws will be framed in order to obtain and secure for the ruling class a monopoly of the results of the labour and skill of the entire community; and the unfranchised people may be left destitute of material happiness, or of the means of obtaining it (9 Mar. 1850).

Perhaps O'Donohoe had read the *Communist Manifesto*. For him both 'the devilish doctrines of Malthus' and *laissez faire* cloaked oppression of the poor. He published reports from the Irish Democratic Association and forecast the day when Tasmania would become 'one member of a grand Southern Confederation of Sovereign States.—AMEN!'²¹ Such exuberance led O'Donohoe into conflict with the government, and the *Irish Exile* died in consequence.

In both the theory and practice of politics, therefore, the Catholic interest was anti-conservative. Nor was this the sole result of its link with liberal philosophy. Liberalism itself extended from mere politics to teach a whole new doctrine concerning man's relations with the state, with his fellow citizens, and with the meaning of existence. This extension became moral enlightenment, to which subject the following paragraphs belong as much as they do to Catholicism.

The appeal to liberalism, both political and general, was clear in the Church's praise of multi-establishment, of tolerance, and of social harmony. When Broughton protested against Polding's recognition at the 1839 levee, the latter replied:

the question at issue regards not vestments and habiliments, crosses and rings, but something of infinitely higher importance; whether each religious denomination is to enjoy freedom of conscience on the footing of perfect equality, or whether a hateful exclusiveness is to be introduced and established; whether one, whom the Right Honorable Lord Glenelg had distinguished 'as the Bishop of the Church of England in Australia,' is to be the only recognised Spiritual Head in the Colony, or whether each religious denomination recognized by the Government in its Head and in its Members, looking up to Her

Gracious Majesty as a common Protector and friend, free from all unseemly jealousy and contentious bickering for exclusive favor and domination, shall be recommended on the distinctly avowed basis of perfect equality, to cultivate peace and social love.²²

Robert William Willson, appointed first Catholic Bishop of Hobart in 1842, used similar terms in reply to Nixon's objection to his assuming that title. When campaigning for Camden, Roger Therry repudiated the vote of any Catholic 'in whose breast there lurks a latent love of ascendancy'.²³ The theme reverberated right down to parish level.

One growth from such feeling was admiration for the *principle* of voluntarism—that absolute separation of Church and State was intrinsically desirable, not merely (as the *Freeman's Journal* already hinted in mid-1851, anticipating the mainstream of Catholic argument in later decades) a necessity to free the Church from secular control. While editor of the *Chronicle*, Duncan suggested to Lang that their supporters unite in securing this end. O'Donohoe too wished to strike off these 'links of gold'. In early 1846 the Tasmanian laity described the Church Act as 'the MAGNA CHARTA OF OUR RELIGIOUS RIGHTS AND STANDING', any amendment of which they would never countenance, 'except, indeed, it be to give place to a more liberal system, (the voluntary system) whereby all classes of Christians would enjoy without distinction, the most perfect equality'.²⁴

Catholics further avowed 'social love' by stressing that they made no discrimination in doing good works. Before coming to Australia Bishop Willson had studied the care of criminals and lunatics, and gave freely of this knowledge in his new field. Caroline Chisholm proclaimed her contempt for sectarian favouritism, and a multi-denominational committee supervised her Immigrants' Home. Sisters of Charity in Hobart and Sydney, lay groups everywhere, practised philanthropy irrespective of the recipients' creed. Catholic Temperance societies also welcomed non-believers. The Reverend John Lynch of Maitland named buildings dedicated to this cause 'Hall of Conciliation', 'Ark of Peace', 'Temple of Concord'.

The Church's advocacy of Temperance brought it particularly close to moral enlightenment. The historians of Irish nationalism in these decades have overemphasized its political aspects; coincidentally, there was an intense drive to have the common Irishman embrace self-improvement, education, and propriety of behaviour. Drunkenness had both smeared the reputation of the people generally and weakened Repeal leadership. Answering the need, Father Theobald Mathew led a crusade for Temperance. Following the Irish pattern, Australian Catholics stressed their abstinence as a qualification for citizenship and idolized O'Connell and Mathew together. The first Catholic Temperance society began at Sydney in 1835, and many others followed. McEncroe (himself an alcoholic at one time), Ullathorne, Lynch, and John Rigney of Illawarra were the outstanding clerical advocates, but differed from most only in

the degree of their enthusiasm. Twice Catholic priests carried the pledge-concept further. While serving as convict chaplain at Norfolk Island, McEncroe became intimate with that ultra-liberal, Alexander Maconochie. The two founded a reform society of which the members (600 altogether; 430 Catholic) pledged themselves to abstain from 'all profane, impure, and improper conversation' and to use their influence for good among other convicts. William Hall, Willson's Vicar-General, later formed a similar society in Hobart.²⁵

On many occasions the Church showed punctilious concern for moral rectitude. Polding's Lenten Instruction for 1837 thus indicted Australian behaviour:

the sacred name of God is blasphemed worse than among the Gentiles; the holiness of an oath is trampled under foot; the Sunday is no longer deemed a day consecrated to the Lord; children grow up in the habits of sin unchecked and unheeded; with a lamentable precocity, before their mental or corporeal powers are developed, they emulate the bad example of their parents; the sanctity of marriage is deemed of no account. Drunkenness, the parent and progeny of misfortune and of crime—who shall recount the victims this monster daily sacrifices to hell?²⁶

Catholic priests were forbidden to attend horse-racing, theatres, or any other public meeting where the cloth might appear out of place. Text-books used in Church schools taught simple morality in a way which no secularist could have bettered. A lay guild excluded from its library all books 'having the smallest tendency to immorality'.

Equally significant was the Church's attitude to that other great ingredient of moral enlightenment—culture. Catholic leaders gave much care to education, and sometimes approached the liberal position. In 1835 Ullathorne and Roger Therry joined with critics of *all* religious instruction in schools to thwart Protestant pressure for official adoption of the British and Foreign scheme. The following year no Catholic dissented when Bourke suggested the National system, and Polding even wrote to the *Australian* in its favour. Appearing before the legislature in opposition to the Gell-Franklin College, a Tasmanian Catholic (T. C. Anstey) expressed his preference for an institution like the new London University—a completely secular establishment.²⁷ Even after the Church in New South Wales swung to the support of denominational primary education, Polding declared his readiness to have older children educated in general schools; moreover, he advocated a literacy qualification for the franchise.²⁸ The Bishop, who once declared that 'the diffusion of sound taste and a love of the fine arts' ranked among his ambitions second only to the spread of religion,²⁹ was more ardently devoted to culture than his clergy at large. Even so, here lay a perceptible difference between his Church and the Anglicans.

Liberal elements in Catholic theology came to the fore. Polding, so

Ullathorne reminisced, was happy to have a colonial newspaper present him as representative of 'a reformed Catholicity, that was universally charitable and tolerant', while his Vicar-General stood charged with 'all the old, mediaeval bigotry and intolerance'.³⁰ The education controversy showed the nub of truth in thus regarding the Bishop, especially when his *Australian* letters angrily denied that the Council of Trent debarred Catholics from reading the Bible. Sensitivity on this point was common: Bible societies, which often alleged priestly determination to keep the laity ignorant, were an important target for Catholic attack. *The Touchstone of the New Religion*, a pamphlet issued by the Church in 1839, averred veneration for the Scriptures, the inability of a priest to pardon an unrepentant sinner, and the sinfulness of persecution of Protestants by Catholics. John McEncroe developed this point, ascribing the horrors of the Inquisition to causes beyond the Church's control.³¹ Another official pamphlet (William Coppinger's *Principles of Roman Catholics*) declared the possibility of the Church committing errors in civil policy, the fallibility of the Pope, and the Church's condemnation of its members practising equivocation, mental reservation, or temporal disloyalty.

In 1845 Francis Murphy, now Bishop of Adelaide, issued a syllabus of *Vindications* which some Protestants interpreted as harbinger of a second Reformation. The *Chronicle* jeered at such *naïveté*, yet the virtual republication of Murphy's document in Port Phillip in 1849 evoked the same reaction. The Anglican cleric William Trollope at once asked *Are the Catholics of Port Phillip Tridentine Romanists?* His purpose was to sneer at the Church, and a local layman, P. A. C. O'Farrell, answered at length. Nevertheless Trollope did establish that the *Vindications* (on such matters as those raised above and on idolatry, Mariolatry, the Pope's power to remit sins) differed in emphasis from the Council of Trent.

Sometimes this liberalism in theology went to peculiar extremes. J. J. Therry told the people of Hobart that in pursuit of Christian unity he was prepared 'cheerfully to sacrifice . . . everything but the strict integrity of faith, and the essential purity of morals. Even the discipline of our Church, sacred and salutary as it has been proved to be, might be materially altered'.³² He struck another odd note when remarking that Protestantism had become 'simply a protestation against error, wherever it exists, and not, as formerly, against the Catholic church'.³³ T. A. Murray argued on similar lines before his fellow Catholics in 1836. He believed that Protestant liberalism for Catholics promised 'an approaching revolution' when all Christians would unite.³⁴ Murray lived by his principles; he was later a pew-holder at the Anglican Church of St John, Canberra.

In 1836 Polding said of the Reformation:

in the first struggles for change, civil or religious, the cry of liberty is raised loudly, and the abstract individual rights of men are asserted strongly. There is an object to be gained. Flatter the pride of man and

he instantly becomes the instrument of his own subjugation. When that change has been brought about, and the transfer of power has been accomplished, a return to those principles of subordination and of restriction, the experience of ages has proved to be essential to the wellbeing of society, is made invariably.³⁵

In 1844 the Bishop explained the troubles of the Spanish Church in similar terms, as did Willson the Italian uprisings of 1848-9. William Hall refused to marry a Catholic who belonged to a masonic society. Clearly these leaders recognized the liberal heresy and its threat to the Church. This awareness showed also in the increasing antipathy to secular education: the Church argued against the character of Sydney University that the professors would form a sect of their own, positively hostile to all belief. Occasionally even the *Chronicle* denied liberal tenets concerning the powers of man and the place of religion in society. Hawksley and St Julian could be as forthright as Bishops:

we maintain that the Christian religion was never *intended* to civilize the world, or to smooth the face of society, or to facilitate the movements of civil government, or to spread abroad knowledge, or to cultivate the reason or for any great worldly objects whatever (11 April 1848).

Obviously the marriage of liberalism and the Church was basically incompatible. The needs of convenience tended to mislead both parties. Yet the Church gained much from the match, and often praised its partner sincerely. As yet there was little thought of divorce.

Friction within the Church

The preceding account dealt with the Church *in toto*. An occasional viewpoint quoted was extreme—Polding's on education, for example, or Murray's and J. J. Therry's on theology—but none repudiated general policy. Constantly, however, internal pressure strove to push the Church towards yet more radical positions, which the hierarchy would not accept. Irishmen and liberal intellectuals, who both did so much to set the tone of the Church, also backed most of these movements. This leftward surge emphasized how far current Catholicism encouraged anti-conservative attitudes. It also showed in microcosm the difficulties of maintaining settled authority and institutions in this time and place.

Among the intellectual dissenters Duncan again stood out. Born a Presbyterian Scot, and converted to the faith in early youth by independent reading, he always valued culture more highly than did the priesthood or D'Arcy's *Chronicle*. Commenting on the difficulties of colonial development, Duncan stressed that because 'none of those feudal, patriarchal, or spiritual ties which bound men together' were present, 'sound moral and intellectual education' should be compulsory.³⁶ In opening the School of Arts at Brisbane in 1849 he argued that the twin advance of learning and commerce promised humanity's best hope for

peace and happiness. 'By the culture of his physical Intellectual and moral constitution, man may greatly ameliorate his condition'; the founders of the School would one day be honoured as national pioneers. Duncan denied human perfectibility, as any Catholic must have, but often he, Parkes, and Harpur discussed the glories which they all believed the future to hold.

Duncan upheld general education, despite the Church's increasing preference for the denominational system; so did Roger Therry, J. H. Plunkett, chairman of the National Board after 1848, and James Martin. This allegiance showed both devotion to culture and the wish that the Church should minimize its separation from the community. Opposing the *Chronicle* during the education controversy of 1844, Duncan insisted 'the Government here is "sincere and friendly", or what is perhaps better, *just and impartial*'.³⁷ By implication he accused official Church policy of seeking more than equality. Therry's repudiation of ascendancy-seekers at Camden had the same tang. When the Catholics of Maitland proposed to break from the district hospital, upon supposed discrimination against Lynch's visiting of patients, Plunkett advised that

such a separation would be a strange departure from the *sound policy* which has been observed during the successive administrations of Sir R. Bourke and Sir George Gipps . . . the object of which has been to amalgamate all Christians as closely as possible in harmony, good feeling, and charity towards each other.³⁸

Plunkett also disagreed with the Church's opposition to the General Cemeteries Bill, and warned the legislature of the power of the priests over their congregations in such issues. Caroline Chisholm probably belonged to the 'integration' school: she reported that many Catholics opposed her refusal to favour fellow-believers.

The intellectuals disliked Irish feeling being exacerbated. Again Duncan's quarrel with the *Chronicle* over education pointed the moral, for the latter evoked old-world feeling against the general system. National differences helped Duncan lose his editorship in 1843. Murphy and McEncroe, both very conscious of their Irishness and hotly loved by the rank and file, were among his leading antagonists in the dispute; he had already gathered ill-will by underplaying the Repeal associations and the welcome paid to J. J. Therry when that veteran hero of Irish Catholics re-visited Sydney in 1841. Plunkett and Roger Therry, despite their Irish birth, again shared Duncan's views. They advised Polding against allowing the display of Irish emblems the day he laid the foundation-stone of St Patrick's, Sydney, in August 1840. An interesting converse was the attempt during the 1843 election to smear Therry as a man who at home would not support Repeal.

Tasmania had few Catholic intellectuals likely to provoke such issues. An exception was T. C. Anstey, son of a squire and a graduate from the University of London. In 1841 he attacked J. J. Therry for neglecting

Christian education. Anstey felt deeply on this issue—already he had told Council of the Church's opposition to the Gell plan—but the *Courier* sneered that he now sought to punish Therry for paying his own views too little heed. A public meeting, Irish to the core, threw out Anstey's charge. He soon went back to England, in time to win fame as part eminent, part eccentric. The Tasmanian story echoed in his continuing battle for the rights of Catholics within society, and of laymen within the Church.³⁹

Irishness caused troubles otherwise than by goading the intellectuals. Whereas most laity and pioneer clergy were Irish, many of the superior clergy appointed after 1832 (starting with Ullathorne and Polding, both Benedictines) were English. Ullathorne clashed immediately with J. J. Therry, who had few attributes save good will, rude vigour, and the admiration built up among his Sydney flock since 1819. Polding's arrival did not ease the tension. He liked the Irish, but wanted his order to shape the Australian mission. Moreover he was prone to domination by a stronger personality, at this time Ullathorne's. Rumours soon spread round Sydney that Therry was to be moved. The lay-members of the committee of St Mary's Cathedral protested, telling the Bishop that his own popularity owed much to Therry's work: for all their expressions of obedience, this sounded like a threat. The Irishman went to Campbell Town, and Polding's homeward references to a Therry 'party' allowed no doubt that feeling ran high. This simmered again in 1838 when Therry was detailed to the Tasmanian mission. It dwindled with the report that the move was only temporary, but in 1839 Polding asked Therry to remain as Vicar-General in Hobart. Ullathorne almost certainly planned this exile from Sydney.

During Ullathorne's absence in Europe in 1836-8 Polding had come under the influence of Francis Murphy and of Charles Lovat, an Englishman who presided over the school attached to St Mary's. Murphy moreover had succeeded to Therry's place in local hearts, and the struggle for ascendancy which ensued on Ullathorne's return incorporated national friction. Ullathorne scored a victory when, assisted by Roger Therry and Plunkett, he persuaded Polding to ban Irish insignia at the St Patrick's stone-laying. He never re-settled, however, experience having convinced him that Australia must become an Irish mission. Subsequently he refused the Hobart bishopric, lest another clash with J. J. Therry result.

Ullathorne left Australia forever late in 1840. Polding too embarked on this voyage, and in his absence Murphy administered the Church. According to Duncan, Irish emotion and criticism of Polding now ran riot. On returning, the Bishop upheld Murphy in not reinstating Duncan to the *Chronicle*, but otherwise had moved away from the Irishman. His new guiding spirit was H. G. Gregory, another English Benedictine who strove to impress the characteristics of his nation and order on the Australian mission, and a man who craved pomp and power.

As Vicar-General, Gregory was largely responsible for a steady worsening in New South Wales of relations between the Irish and their English superiors. Trying to enforce Benedictine rules, he quarrelled with the two Irish religious orders in the colony, the Sisters of Charity and the Christian Brothers. That these disputes signified a general *malaise* appeared in two letters written to Rome from the colony in 1851.⁴⁰ In one, Gregory hoped for the immigration of British and French Catholics who would dilute the Irishness of the laity. In the second, John McEncroe, inheritor of the Therry-Murphy mystique, urged that the Church be saved from 'national antipathies and mutual distrusts' by the creation of many new sees under Irish bishops. His tone suggested that the peak of feeling had passed, but Polding later reported that McEncroe himself was intriguing at this time.⁴¹ The Church in New South Wales was far from unity at mid-century.

However, McEncroe's prime example of 'national antipathies' came from Tasmania, where Willson and J. J. Therry had long pursued a fantastic quarrel. Even before he left Europe the Bishop had stipulated Therry's removal, and so brought out a new, English, Vicar-General, William Hall. Having arrived in Tasmania, the Bishop refused to accept responsibility for Church debts contracted by Therry. Hence developed the great dispute. Not until 1858 was a settlement reached, and meanwhile both parties displayed extreme obstinacy, prevarication, and ill-feeling.

McEncroe was right in emphasizing the place of Irish-English antipathy in the dispute. He personally led a Sydney committee which worked on Therry's behalf; Willson attributed Polding's equivocal attitude on the issue to fear of the Irishman's compatriots in New South Wales. National feeling became overt in August 1849 when a letter signed 'An Irishman' appeared in the Hobart press. It jeered at 'Bishop Willson and his *anti-Irish* clergy', and claimed that such 'birds of passage' had no right to a Cathedral built with Irish money. Willson answered these attempts to alienate 'his Irish flock', while another observer alleged that Therry-ites were declaring their hero 'would be supported "*right or wrong*"—that the Bishop and his Clergy were *English*, and consequently not entitled to *support or protection!!!*'⁴² The *Hobart Guardian* and the *Irish Exile* both took Therry's part, the latter repeatedly attacking Hall and sneering at Willson 'for upholding British supremacy under the veil of Catholicity'.⁴³ Willson's denunciation of Irish priests became so bitter that a relevant document on that account remains unpublished; when approaching retirement, he advised that an Irishman succeed.⁴⁴

During the quarrel Willson accused Polding of meddling, thus himself illustrating the insubordination that controversy bred. Polding's coadjutor, Bishop C. H. Davis, reported of Therry in 1850 that 'nearly all the people sympathise with him, and, as you may suppose, the Bishop's unpopularity is proportionate'.⁴⁵ This often became manifest. One incident concerned the removal of H. N. Woolfrey from the Huon River parish,

apparently because he had declared for Therry. Local Catholics at once criticized Willson in a public statement, which after some delay Woolfrey disowned. The laity responded by denigrating Bishop and priest together!⁴⁶ Even more remarkable was Therry's invocation of ultra-Protestant support. At first this merely continued the tradition of Catholic appeal to the community at large, but by 1850 the anti-Willson party embodied a distinct Protestant faction. Thus Hall replied to an invitation that he should seek a compromise:

Amongst such a set? Mr Therry—Your Redeemer associated with the humbler classes. Vicar-General—Do you call upon us to associate with Orangemen? Mr Therry said it had been remarked that if there were wolves within the fold, there were sheep without it. . . .⁴⁷

The reference to Orangemen bore upon John Morgan, who had long thrown the *Britannia* against Willson. He played hard upon Irish nationalism. When Willson condemned the Italian uprisings of 1848-9, the *Britannia* told 'you kind-hearted Irish Catholics' that similar arguments had long been used against their rebellious compatriots 'by the lords and spiritual prelates of Robert William's country'.⁴⁸ Denounced by Willson, Morgan issued a pamphlet which reiterated his sympathy for Catholic laymen against the tyranny of their priests. O'Donohoe was one Therry-ite who found Morgan's attitude repugnant, and perhaps he was not alone. Early in 1850 a subscription was opened to meet the priest's financial obligations 'and for his support as a clergyman on the voluntary principle'. The *Colonial Times* saw in this a prospect of a Free Catholic Church under a second Luther, but the move fizzled out.⁴⁹

Among both clergy and laity there sometimes appeared dissidence which had no obvious Irish or intellectual origins. Tasmania's pioneer priest, Philip Conolly, so far alienated many of his flock that in 1834 they petitioned the Imperial government for his removal. Then Conolly rebelled against Polding. The priest-in-charge at Melbourne until 1848, P. B. Geoghegan, alleged in 1847 that an 'Orange Catholic' planned to establish an ostensibly pro-Church journal in that district; perhaps this hinted at another alliance of dissidents and ultra-Protestants. Not that Geoghegan lacked warm supporters among the rank and file—in fact the appointment over his head of Bishop J. A. Goold provoked some angry murmurs. For all its tradition, hierarchical government, and firmly-knit belief, the Church suffered many troubles as it grappled with Australian conditions.

From Strength towards Aggression

The story of the Catholic Church had an epic quality. It produced great men, high ideals, and altruistic enthusiasm. Churches, schools, lay institutions, publications, above all priests and other religious, were numerous and effective. The troubles mentioned above remained peripheral to the faith, often passionate and selfless, of most colonial Catho-

lics. By mid-century the Church's achievement ensured that it would be a dominant force in Australian life. To Catholics this progress seemed inspiring; to liberals, impressive; to conservatives, fearful. For contemporaries like Broughton, Burton, and the *Herald*, every advance made by the Church hinted at disruption. Such fears had most logic when prompted by the Church winning locally a position *vis-à-vis* the state and other denominations more advantageous than it held in Britain; and when Churchmen organized pressure-groups which sought to extend Catholic influence still further, at times employing exaggeration, half-truth, and duress, both emotional and physical.

The Church's great achievement was its formal recognition by government. This began in 1803 when Governor P. G. King had allowed James Dixon, a transported priest, to celebrate Mass; subsequently the appointments of Therry and Conolly (1819), Ullathorne, and Polding had the home government's approval. All received financial aid from the state and were allowed to conduct marriages. Then came the crucial Church Acts, from which Catholic leaders sought every possible advantage. 'I have sent in our estimates for this year', Polding wrote once to England '—the Tories will be astonished at our impudence. N'importe: they dare not refuse.'⁵⁰ New South Wales Catholics led a move to have the £30,000 set aside for religious purposes by the 1842 Constitution distributed according to current census figures; nearly every year the Colonial Office received requests for aid from Australian clergy visiting Europe or from their agents in Britain.

Second only to multi-establishment in the Church's constitutional progress was the creation of a territorial hierarchy in Australia early in 1842. Previously Polding had held the titular see of Hiero-Caesarea; now he became Archbishop of Sydney, and plans were laid for appointments to Adelaide and Hobart. Polding later said that the Colonial Office answered 'do what you like' to these moves.⁵¹ Perhaps so, but the authorities did have some reservations. When, late in 1841, Polding requested the transfer of Ullathorne's salary as Vicar-General to Murphy, Under-Secretary James Stephen commented that the Act of Supremacy allowed the government no more right to establish the Church of Rome in a settled colony like New South Wales than in England. 'The difficulty is a grave one', Lord Stanley replied, '... the concurrence to the strict letter of the law, after the series of precedents which have been set, appears as objectionable as its violation.'⁵² Even the tolerant Gipps jibbed at the establishment of the hierarchy; the British outcry of 1851 against the creation of territorial titles further emphasized the novelty of the Australian position.

'In those days', reminisced Ullathorne of the late thirties, 'we had to meet the long-cherished traditions of Protestant supremacy, and to *assert* that equality before the law, which the law itself had given us.'⁵³ He personally had often applied this precept: his *Reply to Judge Burton* bitterly denied the Anglican claim to supremacy. Polding felt no less

strongly. Visiting Tasmania in 1836 he quarrelled with Conolly, who thereupon brought a libel action against his superior. Polding at once demanded of Arthur that the Crown undertake his defence. The matter ended out of court, but not before the Bishop's argument won acceptance. Three years later Polding led an attack on Judge J. W. Willis, who publicly charged Catholics with non-Christian practices. Meetings throughout the colony protested to the Imperial government; Polding reported the matter to the Catholic Institute and his other contacts in Britain. 'You must move heaven and earth in this business', he wrote; 'spare no expense, no trouble; oust Willis.'⁵⁴ In fact the Judge, having quarrelled with his Sydney brethren, soon moved to Melbourne, where he became the focus of another controversy. Catholics were strong among the anti-Willis party, which eventually saw its antagonist leave Australia discredited. Meanwhile Broughton's protests against Polding's appearance at the 1839 levee had provoked not only the latter's statement concerning 'social love' but a demand by Sydney Catholics for the removal of Broughton from the Councils and their insistence that religious liberty was a natural right of man. This matter too had repercussions in Britain: all parliamentarians received accounts, and the Catholic Institute took it up with the Colonial Office.

The right of government-supervised Catholics to practise their religion often aroused contention. Father Therry had to work hard in Tasmania before the government met his demands concerning convicts on government work, assigned servants, women in the house of correction, and state orphans. In New South Wales the general principle triumphed earlier, but Polding fought against Protestant masters having power to direct the religious observances of their assignees and against the compulsory attendance of Catholics at Anglican services aboard transport vessels. These campaigns were successful, but not the Bishop's contesting of Gipps's decision that a group of imprisoned non-Christian aborigines should be put in the exclusive care of an Anglican chaplain.

Disparagement of Irish migrants was another challenge. A Catholic meeting in Sydney protested against the 1841 immigration committee's argument that the prevailing national balance should determine the maximum inflow from Ireland. Duncan saw in this proposal a threat to suppress all minorities; some speakers referred to the Temperance and high morality of the Irish; yet others to the need for local self-government.⁵⁵ In 1842 Daniel O'Connell himself presented to the Commons a petition from Tasmania charging Franklin with discrimination against Irish migrants.⁵⁶ Late in 1849 the St Patrick's Society of Melbourne protested against a decision that few Irish would be sent to Port Phillip in the immediate future because of their precursors' unpopularity; some months later the same organization defended the morals and efficiency of Irish orphan girls recently arrived in the colony.

Many trivial instances illustrated Ullathorne's comment about *assertion*. He himself tried to persuade Gipps to prohibit government officers from

supporting the Bible Society at Sydney; Willson rebuked Denison for countenancing that at Hobart. A meeting of Catholics objected to the decision of the police magistrate at Dungog to employ only Protestant constables; Polding protested to both local and Imperial governments when Justices of the Peace joined in a meeting at Penrith which attacked Catholicism during the Sconce-Makinson crisis. No hint of Anglican supremacy went uncontested. Roger Therry's vain attempt to have any reference to Anglicanism struck out from a public address to Victoria on her accession, Catholic hostility to Gell's College, and Willson's objection to Nixon's Consistorial Court scheme all carried weight, but again mountains grew from molehills. Anglican claims to a schoolroom in Sydney, occupied for a decade by Catholics, although formerly belonging to the Church and Schools Corporation, provoked a long battle. When in 1844 Broughton accused Catholics of proselytizing at the Female Factory, Parramatta, documented denials went to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, Sir Robert Peel, and Lord Stanley. John West described how at Eardley-Wilmot's funeral 'the catholic priests, by a rapid evolution, shot a-head of the procession', neatly ousting the Anglicans.⁵⁷ Hall sought a housing grant for Willson, the instant Nixon had so benefited.

Overall the Church met fair treatment at the hands of the state and in reply often expressed thanks and respect. Apropos titles and designation, however, it was ready to override official wishes. Gipps once suggested to Polding that he find some alternative to 'Roman Catholic Church'; the Bishop refused.⁵⁸ In 1847 Earl Grey directed that Catholic Bishops should not claim territorial titles; no 'do what you like' spirit prevailed now. This despatch arrived just before Perry disputed Goold's claim to the title 'Bishop of Melbourne', and so Deas Thomson asked that the latter adopt some other style. But Goold and Polding continued to do precisely as they liked, and the government found it had no power to enforce its wish. Late in 1848 another directive came from the Colonial Office: the unqualified title, 'Catholic', should not be allowed 'as it confines the character of Catholicity to the Roman Church alone, and impliedly represents all others as schismatical'.⁵⁹ Again the only response was refusal, coupled with a disavowal of any wish for ascendancy.

Such issues raised doubt on whether the Church's devotion to 'social love' and 'perfect equality' was wholehearted. Similar ambivalence marked Catholic attitudes towards the community at large as well as towards the state. The intellectuals' fear that integration was neglected had some justice. Even such actions as forming separate Temperance societies and breaking away from general philanthropic groups lent it credence, although on several such occasions anti-Catholics cast the first stone.

Not only did the 1843 candidatures of O'Connell, Fitzgerald, and Curr, if not Roger Therry, draw heavily on Catholic support, but mob demonstrations, closely following the Irish pattern, honoured all three.

Yet to allege more than instinctive national-religious sentiment would be dangerous. Similarly, although the Sydney elections of 1848, 1849, and 1850 saw attempts to rouse Catholic feeling against Lowe, Wilshire, and Lang, probably no high-level plotting took place. In 1848, at least, Polding (probably himself more sympathetic to Lowe, the liberal Englishman, than were, say, the McEncroe brothers) asked his flock to act with moderation and awareness that good faith could prevail on more than one side. However, a nominee for the Sydney and later Cook-Westmoreland elections of 1851 was Alexander Longmore, a Catholic whom John McEncroe almost certainly prompted to stand. The *Freeman's Journal* welcomed him as a man who if elected would 'represent Catholics as a civil society' in the legislature—just as other interests were to have their voice. Never had Churchmen moved so far from integration. But many Catholics failed to respond. Accordingly Longmore himself minimized his Church backing, McEncroe felt impelled to deny that the clergy were interfering in lay affairs, and the candidate failed. Hawksley, long a critic of direct Church participation in politics, forecast that many of his fellow-believers would adhere to Lang in deliberate hostility to Longmore's candidature.

Catholic attempts to influence the state's education policy had a more positively Machiavellian flavour. McEncroe sought to explain the change from support to condemnation of the National system:

when Sir Richard Bourke proposed the introduction of the Irish system, so called, we had only two or three very indifferent Catholic schools supported by Government, and we were not opposed to any experiment in education that promised to improve the then very defective education of the Catholic children.⁶⁰

Even at face value, this amounted to saying that the Church would co-operate when weak, not when strong. Moreover, McEncroe glossed when implying that the Church had given only passive endorsement to Bourke—he must have known of Polding's letters to the *Australian*. Meanwhile the St Patrick's stone-laying had affected the education controversy. Just previously Gipps interviewed Ullathorne and Polding, telling them his plans to introduce a general system. He had come to this decision, the Governor said, because of popular opinion in its favour. Ullathorne thereupon organized a massive demonstration of Catholics at the ceremony. 'This was the answer given to the remark that we were the weaker party', he concluded his subsequent account; 'it proved us strong in union; and we heard no more of the new scheme.'⁶¹ This spirit reappeared in 1844 when a mob, almost certainly drilled by McEncroe, broke up a meeting of friends of the National system.

Although no Irish emblems appeared at St Patrick's, many other means then built up what Ullathorne described as 'exalted enthusiasm'. Mass processions, brass bands, uniforms and regalia: all frequently acted as bonds of Catholic loyalty. Investiture to the Holy Guild of St Mary

and St Joseph (a Sydney lay society) followed an elaborate, almost religious procedure; its office-bearers and members wore semi-uniform. Melbourne's men of St Patrick advanced to the opening of St Francis's Church, in step with martial music, waving banners and wearing 'rich, embroidered green scarves'.⁶² The Temperance societies revelled in ceremony.

Rarely did these demonstrations have a specific purpose, but their repetition constituted a war of propaganda. It was to check such displays and the fierce reaction of Orangemen that in 1846 the government put through the Processions Prevention Act. The *Chronicle* first opposed then accepted this legislation; other Churchmen appear to have ignored it. Early in 1847 Plunkett, as Attorney-General, wrote to McEncroe, pointing out that the St Patrick's Total Abstinence Society had recently infringed the Act. The priest replied that the procession was not a religious one, nor the society exclusively Catholic. This intransigence accorded with McEncroe's general outlook. Perhaps its extreme manifestation was his plan to hold mass hurley games in Sydney on Boyne Day, to ensure that Catholics would be well-armed against any Orange outbreak.

The Church also fostered emotionalism through purely religious means. Never in Australian history had 'exalted enthusiasm' gone beyond the welcome accorded Polding on his return from Europe early in 1843: Gipps remarked upon the display in his despatches, which generally avoided religion, and a Passionist missionary accompanying the Bishop's party said that in Italy only the Pope would be so honoured. These secular displays merged into the 'singular' pomp with which Holy Week was celebrated immediately afterwards.⁶³ Polding, for all his personal simplicity, knew the power of a highly charged religious atmosphere:

To suppose that the cold forms of Protestantism can ever have effect on our abandoned population is absurd. Zeal amounting to enthusiasm is required. So long as Methodism does not come in, we have no rival to fear. . . .⁶⁴

The Bishop did not hesitate to invent ritual when he felt the occasion demanded celebration. McEncroe mishandled the facts of religion more grossly. A pamphlet he wrote depicted Calvin as a Sodomite, Elizabeth as a sex-crazed infidel, and the Reformation as inspired by their passions. Perhaps vulgar Catholicism rested heavily on such propositions.

Australian history was also distorted—to create a deliberate heroic mystique and incidentally to encourage feeling at odds with integration. The most fascinating chapter in this story concerned the fate of some consecrated bread supposedly left in Sydney by Jeremiah Flynn, a priest deported from Sydney in 1817 after a few months' service. Ullathorne described the 'miraculous' preservation of the bread in *The Catholic Mission in Australasia*, and played upon this theme to foment

enthusiasm at the St Patrick's stone-laying, perhaps on other occasions also. Later historians have found grave inaccuracies in his account. Similar hyperbole sounded time and again. 'If sir, I for one moment take a retrospective view of my religion in this colony . . . what do I perceive during that period but one continued scene of cruelty and dire oppression'.⁶⁵ this was nonsense in the Sydney of 1841, even at a St Patrick's Day dinner. Father Therry frequently invoked such battle-cries, which must have strongly affected those whose memories of Ireland were fresh. But Polding himself, during his trip to Europe in 1841-2, exaggerated the degree of erstwhile persecution, and it was Murphy's party who then objected. Duncan and D'Arcy both used such tactics in editing the *Chronicle*.

Occasionally the Church appeared guilty of deliberate dissimulation. The prospectus of the Melbourne St Patrick's Society disclaimed any religious allegiance, and sought the membership of both Protestant and Catholic Irishmen; yet members attended the opening of St Francis's and the celebration of High Mass there, and apparently acted on Goold's direction when upholding the Irish orphans.⁶⁶ When protesting to the legislature against the Processions Prevention Bill the Holy Guild claimed to be little more than 'a mere benefit society'; yet not only was investiture semi-religious, but Duncan had earlier said that it offered 'certain advantages peculiar to the Roman Catholic Church'.⁶⁷ Such equivocation lent weight to the Protestant charge that the Church hoped to attract converts by opening her Temperance societies to all. One critic alleged that Rigney administered the pledge from the altar: certainly his society met in the Illawarra church, an odd procedure for a group proud of its Protestant support.⁶⁸ In this same district, a Catholic stronghold, Caroline Chisholm settled several small farmers: perhaps she was not quite so impartial after all. Certainly her Catholic supporters spoke with two voices. At a public meeting in August 1847, McEncroe affirmed that the Catholic clergy as a body 'had nothing whatever to do with Mrs Chisholm's mission'; a *Chronicle* editorial later said nearly the direct opposite.⁶⁹

Whether the Church wanted predominance in Australia is a somewhat unreal question, but one to which this study must lead. Three passages from homeward letters suggested the possibility.⁷⁰ 'We only want priests to make this country Catholic', Polding wrote, after detailing the progress achieved in his early months in Australia. This comment might have sprung from mere exuberance, but not so the Bishop's advocacy of a territorial hierarchy. He emphasized:

the utmost importance that the Holy See take first possession of the principal towns as seats of episcopal jurisdiction. The first possession gives an incalculable advantage; and in the minds of vast numbers, will form a plausible reason for continuing in schism in case that first possession be taken by the Bishops of the Anglican sect.

Polding's words bore fruit: Rome anticipated Lambeth in appointing Bishops to Adelaide, Perth, and (when the Imperial government planned a settlement on the north coast) Victoria Harbour. The third letter, from H. G. Gregory's sister, a Benedictine nun, was the most forthright of all. 'Here, if anywhere . . . we see our holy faith practised in its primitive fervour', she wrote in March 1848, 'there is no doubt but that the country will become entirely Catholic.' The Sister had just arrived and was probably elated by the Sconce-Makinson conversions; yet her brother's thoughts might have informed her artless pen.

If this account has appeared to deny the right of Catholics to pursue their religion without restraint, contemporary Orangemen would have found it far too lenient. Their accusations might even have deserved more attention than they here receive. In any case, the Catholic Church remained peculiarly antagonistic to the conservative view of society. Encouraging liberalism or—by asserting her own autonomy—denying it, she always offended that ideal.

PROTESTANTISM

THE DISRUPTING EFFECTS of Protestantism ran parallel to those of the Roman Catholic Church. It too encouraged liberalism, fomented ill-feeling within the community, challenged English tradition, and denied certain types of authority. Overall, however, the story of Protestantism had less power, purpose, and unity. Embracing Low Church Anglicans, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Independents (Congregationalists), Baptists, Jews, and sectaries, the subject provoked a great breadth of material, but it rarely achieved satisfying depth. Australian conditions little encouraged Protestant development; the sublime issues of the Reformation arose in a form so constricted and imitative as to verge on the ridiculous.

The Quality of Protestantism

Every denomination mentioned above was functioning in both colonies by 1835, and their expansion continued steadily. Statistics (see Appendix II) and much pietistic history show that the institutional achievement was substantial, yet its full appreciation requires notice of developments beyond church-building and nominal allegiance. Bible and Tract societies, so much disliked by Roman Catholics, had solid support throughout the colonies. Wesleyans and Presbyterians sometimes attempted to establish such groups on a denominational basis, but local auxiliaries of the 'British and Foreign' organizations, which virtually all Protestants supported, were more powerful. Apart from the depression years, these groups flourished, so that by 1849 Bible societies had risen in all larger towns, while in 1850 some 12,650 tracts circulated throughout Sydney. Sunday Schools prospered too. Wesleyans gave them particular attention, forming an independent 'Union'; the rest often pooled resources.

These churches shared the common interest in primary education. Tasmanian Protestants supported the British and Foreign system, applauding its practice and regretting Denison's decision to adopt a quasi-denominational plan. In 1849 they established a society to propagate the British and Foreign scheme. This had also been the purpose of the Australian Schools' Society, which was founded in the mid-thirties in Sydney and for some years ran its own school. In general, however, the New South Wales Protestants did not find a consistent policy, and later (except for the Wesleyans) supported the National

system. Wesleyans further struck out on an independent path by establishing grammar schools in both capitals in 1839. Several Presbyterian ministers—notably J. D. Lang, Henry Carmichael, and James Forbes—were active in developing good secondary schools, although building on a theological basis broader than their own creeds. The Hobart Town High School, eventually begun in 1850, was largely a Protestant creation.

The heathen was remembered. J. D. Lang organized a group of German missionaries who worked among the aborigines at Moreton Bay; L. E. Threlkeld (working for the London Missionary society until 1828, then independent) and William Watson (Church Missionary Society until 1840, then independent) struggled for years to maintain stations at Lake Macquarie and Wellington Valley; Wesleyans established the Buntingdale mission near Geelong, and Baptists a school at Merri Creek outside Melbourne. All unsuccessful, these efforts lacked neither devoted servants nor lay support. Congregationalists in Tasmania made tentative efforts to minister to the island's dwindling native population. Moreover, the great British missionary organizations (British and Foreign Aborigines Protection Society, C.M.S., L.M.S., etc.) had considerable backing. The Wesleyan Society in Hobart once collected £583 13s. 5d. in twelve months; in Sydney, at the nadir of the depression, a single meeting of the L.M.S. auxiliary raised £113 os. 3½d. Even the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews had its devotees in Tasmania. Further instances of Protestant unity were in the maintaining of churches for seamen, and in the conduct of several journals—*Sydney Protestant Magazine*, *True Catholic*, *Gleaner*, *Christian Standard*. Clerics of one denomination would fill the pulpits of another, without causing any concern. This process culminated in Tasmania with the establishment, in 1844, of an Evangelical Union on 'the broad principles of biblical christianity'.¹ Melbourne followed in 1847, but Sydney did not, although the Tasmanian example was held up for emulation. Congregationalists led this cause. Lay societies were numerous, their chief purpose being to raise funds for building churches and paying clergy. Sometimes they undertook adult education or the functions of benefit societies. Other groups concentrated on philanthropic work, occasionally restricted to fellow-believers but more often extended to all.

Outside the major denominations were several smaller groups. Between 1832 and 1837 two Quaker missionaries, James Backhouse and G. W. Walker, travelled throughout the Australian colonies, establishing circles in Sydney and in Hobart, where Walker settled. Apart from his endeavours, however, this creed made little impression. An English Mormon named William Barrett was appointed to Sydney in 1842, and by 1846 had won eleven adherents; late in 1851 'Mormon Mania' swept Sydney. In May 1850 some Unitarians met in Sydney; a couple of weeks earlier German Lutherans resident in Melbourne had planned to obtain a minister. Several clergymen gathered hybrid congregations. Thus the pioneer Baptist minister at Moreton Bay formed a United

Evangelical Church and the Presbyterian Alexander Laurie received a call at Portland from Roman Catholics and many different Protestants. Thomas Atkins, an Anglican, ministered to Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and his own co-religionists at a Free church in Balmain, Sydney.

Only one unorthodox sect made any real impact, that of John Wroe, an Englishman who preached Christian Israelism. He forbade shaving and recourse to doctors, and imposed rules concerning food, drink, and clothing. A disciple of Wroe's, one Charles Robertson, came to Australia in the late thirties, and worked with such effect that the creed spread to Port Phillip and Tasmania. Authority considered checking its excesses. In 1843-4 the Master himself visited New South Wales, addressing many meetings in Sydney and surrounding districts. Wroe had recorded the 'Private Communications' granted him by God: their dominant impression is of mumbo-jumbo and excitement that relied on sexual allusions. On remarking Wroe's departure from Sydney in February 1844, John McGarvie commented that the Australians had been 'too 'cute for him'.² Nevertheless the creed lived on, and in 1850 Wroe returned. 'If I had displeasure in England it is not so here', he wrote home, 'for the Lord says his prophet is not without honour, save in his own country.'³ Chapels arose at Melbourne, Sydney, Geelong, Liverpool, and Penrith: perhaps their congregations numbered a thousand or more. The sect survives still in Australia.

It is easy to give a quantitative statement of Protestant strength—adherents, churches, schools, and clerics. To assess the dynamism of the different groups and their influence within society is a far harder task. However, some general impressions do emerge from the evidence.

Repeated internal quarrels marked Presbyterianism in New South Wales. Was the local Church a representative of the Scottish establishment, upholding that heritage against social change and spiritual innovation? Or was it a loose federation of evangelicals, crying out against all corruption? McGarvie embodied the first view, J. D. Lang the second. Until these antipathies were resolved, Presbyterianism could not adopt a distinctive character and influence in the older colony. The churches were little more than meeting places for a few hundreds of devotees, who spent their energy in wrangling among themselves. About the matters in dispute they felt passionately, for they believed them central to the Christian message; but the outsider is likely to conclude that the feuds became more important than their original cause. In Tasmania these strains had far less importance, for the Reverend John Lillie, dominant Presbyterian in the island, managed to combine the McGarvie-Lang positions. Before 1850 his Church remained comparatively united and very active. This was, however, more a matter of organization and diplomacy than of spiritual force. Nowhere did Presbyterianism become a popular crusade.

Although numerically weaker than Presbyterianism, Wesleyanism and

its offshoots moved more hearts more deeply. Detailed figures of Church activity suggest that a high proportion of nominal adherents attended regular service, enabled to do so by the many lay-preachers who served in small chapels and occasional places of worship. The New South Wales Wesleyans, like Roman Catholics, petitioned for redistribution of state aid according to changing census figures: evidence that these two denominations were confident of expanding their strength, both absolutely and relatively. Indeed the comparison with Roman Catholicism extended quite far, as Polding himself implied when he suggested that this rival alone could dispute his Church's influence over the 'abandoned'. Certainly followers of Wesley succeeded in arousing 'zeal, amounting to enthusiasm'. In the early forties Sydney and nearby districts were swept by classic revivalism of which 'the fruit soon appeared in changed lives, in earnest work for Jesus, and in cheerful giving to His cause'.⁴ At other times and places this fervour manifested itself in 'primitive' forms, noticed below.

The most notable Wesleyan cleric was W. B. Boyce, Superintendent in New South Wales from 1846. He had close ties with the Allen family, shining lights of the Sydney laity, and they formed a powerful leadership. In Tasmania the Reverends Joseph Orton and Nathaniel Turner stood out in their selfless devotion. The Allens' counterpart in the island was Henry Reed of Launceston. 'He is a wonderful trophy of saving mercy', Turner wrote, 'and flames with loving zeal for the salvation of perishing men.'⁵ Reed was later to help finance the Salvation Army.

Congregationalism was more powerful in the smaller colony, probably because of the quality of its ministers. Frederick Miller (Hobart), Charles Price (Launceston), and that 'man of colossal intellect',⁶ John West, were a splendid trio. Among their achievements were the Evangelical Union, and a Home Mission Society which maintained a few itinerant clergymen. One of these, Joseph Beazley, reported in 1837 that 'the attention and seriousness in every place where the word is preached is equal to anything I ever witnessed'.⁷ The cause in Tasmania also gained from the generosity of a very wealthy merchant, Henry Hopkins. His reward was great: the dedication of West's *History*. Another Hobart merchant, Frederick Haller, was also a generous supporter. Notable names appeared among the Sydney laity too: John Fairfax, David Jones, and Ambrose Foss, while J. P. Fawcner straddled both colonies. The leading Independent clergy in Sydney, Robert Ross and Barzillai Quaife, were more than nonentities, but failed to exercise a pervasive influence. Tasmanian Congregationalism, in short, managed sometimes to achieve Methodistical fervour, while that in New South Wales scarcely went deeper than *bourgeois* discussion.

Baptists had only marginal importance. John Saunders, clergyman in Sydney from 1834 to 1847, was more important as a Temperance pioneer than as a theologian or church-builder. He was a sane, intelligent

man, representing one side of his Church's character; the layman John McKaeg, who pioneered the sect in Sydney and continued to hold meetings after Saunders's arrival, represented another. 'This man possessed the gift of uncommon good lungs, and voluntarily crying', said one commentator, who nevertheless witnessed McKaeg's influence over Samuel Terry.⁸ A group of Particular Baptists had their own nucleus in Port Phillip by 1850, but the Melbourne Church and that in Tasmania generally followed the Saunders model.

Men do not join small, demanding, groups unless they feel deeply. Thus Unitarians, Quakers, Mormons, and Wroeites, though few in number, had some significance. Noteworthy too were the handful of men who suffered overwhelming personal experience: Samuel Newham, an ex-convict, in search of salvation among the Tasmanian Wesleyans; John Wilcox, a British soldier serving in Australia, tormented as to whether the Church of England, however Low, met God's demand; John Davis, a working-class Presbyterian so distressed by the heresies of Wroe and Mormonism that he took up his pen to refute them. Undoubtedly, a hard core of believers was absolutely devoted to the Protestant faith.

Few contemporaries tried to estimate the power of Protestantism. Both Arthur and Denison remarked on the influence of Wesleyans among the poor; Gipps commended the Church Acts for promoting religion generally. John West took an optimistic view:

The tendency of small communities is not unfavourable to the progress of religious denominations. The only interruption to the monotony of life is found in the church: the only association which can be readily offered to strangers is provided by the religious bond. Opinion acts with increased power where the social inequalities are slight.⁹

A similar theme appeared in the verdict of T. H. Braim, a liberal Anglican: 'public feeling is all on the side of the form of religion, how much of the power exists among us, the searcher of hearts alone can tell'.¹⁰ Dozens of statements showed that many believers felt that 'power' was singularly lacking. Such evidence was often untrustworthy, but probably not the recollection of David Blair, a disciple of Lang and future historian, that Sydney in 1850 had many chapels and churches but also thousands of citizens untouched by religious feeling.

Protestant denominations were effective only within the cities and agricultural areas. The pastoral hinterland presented difficulties far beyond such tiny groups' power to solve. So the tendency was for religion of this type to be more influential in Tasmania than in New South Wales. For the rest, generalizations must become even vaguer. Around that hard core of believers clustered men moved by habit, goodwill, and uncertainty. Protestantism could summon a sizeable number under its banners, and exercise a perceptible influence. Certainly, its nature affected colonial life.

Self-Will Rampant

The great sixteenth-century Protestants were scarcely less suspicious of undisciplined individual judgment than was Rome. Nevertheless, the paramount result of the Reformation was to encourage that self-will so abhorred by Broughton, and the peak of this trend came at mid-nineteenth century. In the Australian colonies, as throughout the world, Protestants battled against restraint, both secular and spiritual, on the practice of their religion. A survey from denomination to denomination shows that this discontent incorporated three major themes: resistance to any ecclesiastical hierarchy; antipathy to control from Britain; and antipathy to control by the state.

As already said, Presbyterianism in New South Wales suffered many internal strains. The Lang-McGarvie quarrel began in the early thirties, and Lang's chief achievement during his visit to Britain in 1836-7 was to gather nine ministers and fifteen schoolteachers, with whom he planned to reassert supremacy. Returning to New South Wales, Lang disputed McGarvie's compliance with a recently-passed Temporalities Act, under which the local Church had status only as a branch of the Church of Scotland. The latter had long claimed jurisdiction over the colonial Church, although so far the question had been academic. Now Lang chose to dispute this claim, and when defeated withdrew to form the independent Synod of New South Wales. The Scottish Church bewailed 'violation of presbyterian order' and advised the government not to grant the breakaways state aid. Gipps, however, had provisionally done so, and Lang returned to Europe to secure the rights of his Synod. In his absence colonial Churchmen reached a compromise, and the comprehensive Synod of Australia resulted (October 1840). Although remaining formally connected with the Church of Scotland, this new body emphasized its independence of jurisdiction.

Lang soon denied the compromise. For years past an admirer of the theory of voluntaryism, he announced in February 1842 that he could no longer accept state aid in good conscience. He therefore separated once more, although not until 1849-50 did another Synod of New South Wales gather around him. Meanwhile the 1843 'Disruption' of the Church of Scotland itself—the breakaway of those who repudiated state interference in Church affairs—had affected the colony. Many local Churchmen felt they must testify with the Disruptors by severing all connexion with the Church of Scotland. In 1843-4 there were some moves to have the Church Acts amended to allow aid to these Free Churchmen, while the Synod tried to work out a compromise. By 1846, however, these efforts had failed and the Synod of Eastern Australia separated from the parent body. Like the Free Churchmen in Scotland, its members preferred to deny all state aid rather than compromise their belief.

Similar complications plagued the Church in Port Phillip. A local

Presbytery within the Synod of Australia was formed in 1842, and quickly bridled under control from Sydney. In 1847 James Forbes established a one-man Free Presbyterian Synod of Australia Felix in sympathy with the Disruptors. That year arrived in Melbourne the Reverend A. M. Ramsay, originally a member of the United Presbyterian Church and so representative of a long tradition of voluntarism and of hostility to the established Church of Scotland. His attitudes found favour, and in January 1850 Ramsay led a motley bunch of clergy to form the United Presbyterian Church of Victoria. These men, as one historian has remarked, 'ventured forth on a home made creed of their own'.¹¹

Tasmanian Presbyterians did not wholly avoid such troubles. In the mid-thirties believers in Hobart quarrelled over the morality and ministrations of their chief parson, Archibald McArthur, only a few continuing to attend his services. A number among the rest opposed a majority decision to appeal to the Church of Scotland for recognition and support. The Disruption forced a statement proclaiming judicial independence from the Church of Scotland and a flurry of resignations when the leadership emphasized its link with the Church of Scotland in rebutting Nixon's Consistorial Court proposals.¹² Ultimately Free congregations, at first without clerical leadership, developed in both Launceston and Hobart.

The Wesleyans' history was more interesting but less complex. The great problem was how to restrain the enthusiasm of many devout laymen. Discontent first arose in Hobart in 1837-8, an erstwhile London lay-preacher named William Barnett leading a Wesleyan Association hostile to both the parent body and its local representatives. Orton lamented that 'methodistically seditious publications' aroused disaffection, especially among class leaders and Sunday School teachers. 'The people here . . .', he said, 'are like tinder prepared to ignite at every falling spark of radicalism.'¹³ Such sentiment spread to Launceston, as Orton discovered when he referred the congregation there to a decision of British headquarters in justifying a particular liturgy. The reply so bluntly scorned this argument that the District ministers protested:

Such a right of dictation as is assumed in the document before us as to the mode of conducting the worship of God, would be an undue interference with the scriptural rights of a minister of Christ, and an infringement on the rules of our connexion, the operation of which would be as injurious as the bounds might be indefinite.¹⁴

Nathaniel Turner repaired the quarrel with the Association in 1840. He seemingly demanded less rigid devotion to the home Conference.

These events were not matched in Sydney until 1842 when an 'unnatural and disgraceful schism effected by two or three unreasonable men' disturbed the official body.¹⁵ The breakaways styled themselves Australian Methodists and for a while were remarkably active in Sydney

and nearby rural areas, even having separate schools. One of the dissidents was Nathaniel Pidgeon, revealed by his autobiography as a street-corner evangelist of classic type, subject to 'the shouting influence' and capable of fanatic enthusiasm. Official restriction on such lay-preaching was one factor which alienated the Australian Methodists; another, the feeling that as the clergy were maintained by grants from either Britain or the local treasury, they were dangerously irresponsible to lay control. Even Pidgeon balked at the invective cast upon both British and colonial clergy; tyrannous though the British were, the Australian Methodists told their sympathizers at home, colonial ministers went further in demanding obedience, and were money-grubbers besides.¹⁶

J. D. Lang sought to persuade the legislature to recognize the validity of marriages and baptisms conducted by the new sect. His efforts met no response and the group died out before 1850. By then the 'disaffection' of other Primitive Methodists had bothered the New South Wales Conference,¹⁷ and a few chapels of this persuasion arose. Almost certainly in order to contain this tendency, the official leadership relaxed its interdict on street-preaching and camp-meetings. A boisterous Wesleyan Association flourished in Melbourne.

The principles of Independency have always provoked charges of encouraging the tyranny of a congregation over its minister, charges as frequently denied—most notably in this time and place by John West. The case of William Jarrett, an Independent pioneer in Sydney, supported the critical view. Friction arose during 1835, Jarrett allegedly reading his sermons 'and that by no means in an animated strain', failing to make himself comprehensible to the less learned of his flock, and behaving imperiously to all. This dissatisfaction boiled over when the minister married a young woman who not only was outside the Church but—'she had been gay'.¹⁸ The congregation dissolved the connexion, and in his *Farewell Discourse* Jarrett spoke of persecution, slander, and disbelief. Barzillai Quaife had a similar experience.

There were many lesser incidents of the same kind, Lang himself incurring some criticism from his congregation. One earnest 'Labouring Mechanic' impugned even so flexible an organization as the Quakers': personal revelation was all, and anything which intervened between the individual and God deplorable. Such minor eruptions were, however, less important than the course of Protestantism within the Church of England, for although the Catholic influence of Broughton and Nixon percolated deep into their Church, it failed to conquer all Low Church sentiment, sometimes even stimulating it.

Nixon, the sterner authoritarian, first experienced real difficulties with his clergy, especially Thomas Wigmore and Gregory Bateman. The Bishop was very much the High Churchman when disciplining his subordinates, and so doctrinal attitudes inflamed these quarrels. Yet

even some of the High Church clergy reproved the Bishop's procedures. Further trouble arose between Nixon and his senior chaplain, William Bedford, who at one stage refused to hand over the key of the cathedral to his superior! In 1847 Bedford broke his life-long rule against joining multi-denominational groups, declaring that support of the Bible Society was necessary to thwart Puseyism.

The Reverend James Edmondston, an enthusiastic critic of episcopal power, pursued a quarrel with Broughton during the mid-forties, but it was not until the Sconce-Makinson conversions that the Sydney diocese suffered a crisis. William Woolls, a future clergyman, then issued two pamphlets which attacked Tractarianism as 'a step . . . towards re-establishing the Popish notion of merit and the doctrine of Justification by works' and the offertory for raising a fund which might render the priest independent of his flock.¹⁹ Woolls wanted the laity to assist in the election of bishops, and the Church to ally itself with other Protestants. Several congregations sympathized with such attitudes. When Broughton disciplined F. T. C. Russell for having criticized Tractarian influence, another demonstration of Low Anglican feeling ensued. Similarly the High Church tone of the Bishops' Conference of 1850 led to demonstrations in Hobart (opening a new, more bitter struggle between the two factions), while even in Melbourne Perry's firm Protestantism did not halt all criticism.²⁰

Meanwhile moves developed in both Melbourne and Sydney to found a Free Church of England. Although apparently failing, they showed the growing preference for voluntarism among Protestants. Lang's 'conversion'; Presbyterian sympathy for the Disruptors; the rise of left-wing Methodism; the view of a Wesleyan leader in Tasmania that state aid had proved disastrous: all emphasized the trend. It had many facets, but none more important than the refusal of state interference. Instead, the role of the individual believer became yet more effective and immediate.

'The Pride of Equality'

In these words West described the feeling with which the various Churches insisted on their equal standing before the law.²¹ Protestants pursued this ideal no less fervently than did Roman Catholics, each of the major denominations making a distinctive contribution to the argument. All believed that equality served the cause of Christianity, and certainly it furthered the immediate progress of their respective Churches. Nevertheless, Broughton's lament that such insistence developed secularism and indifference to ultimate truth was sound. The glory of toleration, claims to civil rights, and abuse of the Church of England tended to become all-important, while the advance of religion went neglected.

Presbyterians had one very powerful argument to advance: that

since their faith was established in Scotland, and the colonies were *British*, their status should be precisely that of local Anglicans. To be effective, this proposition required close connexion between colonial Presbyterians and the Church of Scotland. So it became far more significant in Tasmania, where this link remained stronger, than in New South Wales. In 1835 the Hobart laity petitioned the Church of Scotland to take the Tasmanian Church under her jurisdiction, to send out ministers, and to dispute any Anglican claim to ascendancy in the colonies. In this year, too, a schoolteacher named James Thomson published his *Remarks on the Status of the Presbyterian Church in the British Colonies*. He claimed that as a matter of history statute law determined the established religion of Britain from time to time; as no such legislation pertained to the colonies, the tendency to give privilege to the Church of England had no foundation. Rather, some Imperial Acts had recognized dual establishment—for example one which decreed that official chaplains in South Australia should be either Presbyterian or Anglican.

Thomson and his fellows must have celebrated in August 1836 when the legislature resolved that the Churches of England and Scotland should enjoy equal standing. Interim Administrator Kenneth Snodgrass, himself a Scot, encouraged this claim, but legal intricacies and the arrival of Franklin delayed its being established beyond doubt. However, the Church Act soon did so. Meanwhile the Scottish authorities had answered the earlier call for help, and through their efforts, which sought and received the approval of the Colonial Office, John Lillie went to Hobart.

Soon after his arrival in September 1837 Lillie brushed with Archdeacon Hutchins, who attacked dual-establishment as the first stage towards infidelity and the end of all state aid to religion. 'This certainly is a grave charge', declared Lillie, no less reluctant to see such a result.²² But, he urged, Hutchins's argument still rested on the false presupposition of Anglicanism having unique status. In fact, the Presbyterian suggested, Hutchins was abetting the causes he professed to oppose. If dual-establishment were denied, the only tenable alternative in law was that *no* church was established; moreover, religion suffered from any promotion of ill-feeling. These arguments were sound, but Hutchins must have believed himself vindicated when Lillie (as had Thomson) assented to state support for Romanism:

we look upon the recent ecclesiastical arrangement as a great experiment, in which two systems of belief, fundamentally opposed to each other, and *one* of them therefore, necessarily false, are to meet upon equal terms—and no man, who believes in the irresistible energy of truth, when opposed to error, can for a moment doubt the issue.²³

This argument differed entirely from that which upheld *dual*-establishment. Subsequently Presbyterians diverged still further by joining with

Baptists and Independents to assert 'The Equal Legal Status of all the Churches in the Australian Colonies' against Nixon's Consistorial Court scheme.

By then the Presbyterians in Tasmania had become leaders of an effective political pressure group. Sometimes it acted on matters directly affecting religion. During 1839, for instance, battles were fought over the government withdrawing its subsidy from a Presbyterian minister at Oatlands in favour of an Anglican; over the occupation of a church at Bothwell which Hutchins claimed for exclusive use although previously shared; and over a schoolroom at Sorell. Education caused many disputes. Not only did Protestants press for the British and Foreign system, but also they scarified the Franklin-Gell College plan. The Queen's School was no more popular, and probably inspired the Protestants to plan their own secondary school from 1843 onward. Eardley-Wilmot sympathized, cutting off aid to Queen's and promising the Protestants a grant of land. His recall disrupted all plans, and Denison later gave the site to Hutchins School! Lillie protested angrily, until Denison offered the land on which the High School soon arose.²⁴

The Protestants did not stop at these specific issues. Lillie threatened Franklin with withdrawal of support from his government, and apparently sided with Franklin's enemies during the crisis immediately preceding his recall.²⁵ This was surely a reaction to Gell's high standing at Government House; conversely, Lillie and his followers stood by Eardley-Wilmot, the Anglicans' arch-enemy. Thus the *Observer*, launched in 1846 under Frederick Haller's ownership, praised this administration, while among Eardley-Wilmot's nominees to replace the 'Patriotic Six' were Henry Hopkins and Henry Reed. Denison was well aware that 'Presbyterians' ('Protestants' would have been more accurate) stood to lose by his educational reforms, and also noticed their influence in Hobart's rudimentary municipal government. The *Advertiser*, which Thomson edited for some years, and the *Colonial Times*, to which Lillie probably contributed, were further weapons in this group's armoury.

Wesleyans asserted equality by stressing their links with the Church of England. Ralph Mansfield regretted that the census tabulated his co-religionists under 'Dissenters', since for many it was 'a point of conscience, and in some sense, a point of honor, to repudiate the imputation of dissent'.²⁶ Orton, particularly, was a stickler for both the rights of his Church and 'adhesion to the usages and recommendations bearing upon a uniformity with the Established Church'.²⁷ Men of such disposition felt aggrieved when Anglicans emphasized the gulf separating the two groups. Thus 'A Friend to Truth and Peace' angrily rejected the charge of H. T. Stiles, Tractarian priest at Windsor, that all Wesleyans were schismatics. 'Where the doctrines of the Church of England are fully and fairly preached to the people', he argued, 'neither Dissenters

nor Methodists can make much progress.'²⁸ By implication, the followers of Wesley were truer Anglicans than Stiles and his like.

A prime principle of the Congregationalists (and all other voluntaries) was that the state should abstain utterly from religious matters, and so maintain a negative equality. This view permeated editorial after editorial in the *Examiner*; one, almost certainly written by West, repudiated the term 'religious toleration' since it implied that the state had a right to allow (and so to disallow) the practice or religion, whereas in fact man had an inalienable claim to this freedom.²⁹ The *Observer* described the function of the state in John Locke's terms, deliberately opposite to that proposed by H. P. Fry in the *Herald of Tasmania*.

The Congregationalists' attitude entailed support for the abolition of all state aid: if any group, such as themselves, refused to share this bounty, it was unfair that any others should so benefit. This feeling remained academic so long as the Imperial government held the initiative over finance, but already West's congregation spoke of the need to 'equalize taxation and produce the happy fruits of political justice'.³⁰ Ross and Saunders characteristically told the 1844 Education Committee that any denomination wanting separate schools must provide its own funds.

The Jewish community carried similar premisses to a different conclusion. 'As British subjects', one petition to the New South Wales legislature declared, 'the Israelites of this colony are entitled to the same rights of civil, political and religious liberty which their fellow subjects of different religious opinion enjoy.'³¹ Therefore, the oft-pressed argument ran, we have a right to financial aid. The general Protestant response to the Jews' campaign was passive sympathy.

Chief among other issues involving 'the pride of equality' was the right to perform marriage. Even the staid McGarvie disobeyed a law which required that any but an Anglican minister demand declarations from the couple that they were his parishioners. The Free Churchmen of New South Wales were very sensitive on this matter, because of doubt as to the legality of marriages performed by colonial ministers having no connexion with the Church of Scotland. An Act of 1851 (14 Vic. No. 28) finally removed all discrimination in New South Wales; in Tasmania earlier legislation (6 Vic. No. 18) went far towards recognizing equality, but not enough to disarm all protests.

Overall, Protestants constantly scrutinized Anglican claims. 'If Romish assumption is intolerable', declared Lang's *Colonial Observer*, 'Protestant or Episcopalian assumption is still more so.'³² The Presbyterians of both colonies protested against Anglican dignitaries remaining on the councils; Roman Catholics and Protestants joined in criticizing Gell's College, Nixon's Consistorial Court, and the Bills Perry had introduced in 1850. Such feeling even led Protestants to attack Broughton's criticism of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and some lectures Nixon

gave on the iniquities of that Church. Roman Catholics hated Tractarianism because it threatened their own strongest citadel; Protestants hated it because thereby the ancient enemy seemingly won new ground. Thence, and out of the common fear of Anglican ascendancy, sometimes emerged a peculiar alliance.

Sectarianism

Despite on one hand the sympathy arising from this alliance, and on the other Roman Catholic progress 'from strength towards aggression', Protestant antipathy to Roman Catholicism was often excessively virulent and so responsible for much ill-feeling. Individuals like Lang and other leading Protestants, Bible and Tract societies, and various journals (*Colonist*, *Colonial Observer*, *Sydney Gazette*, and even the *Herald*) long maintained a steady fire. Then in the mid-forties explicit Orange activity began. Over a dozen lodges opened in New South Wales, and John Morgan abetted such developments in Tasmania. The *Sentinel*, published in Sydney between 1844 and 1848, dealt almost exclusively in anti-Catholic propaganda; its chief writer was J. B. Laughton, then an Anglican layman but later a Presbyterian minister. Scarcely less violent were the Melbourne *Argus* while edited by William Kerr (1846-8), and Morgan's *Britannia*. Although even the lodges had their moderates, and although the movement weakened after many members emigrated to California, these years sounded a high pitch of organized sectarianism.

The major charge against Roman Catholics was that they planned domination. 'From Supreme Courts—through benches of magistracy—in halls of municipality—down to the constabulary forces of Sydney and the colony, Papacy lords and predominates beyond tolerance': this half-sentence summed up many *Sentinel* editorials.³³ Elaborating a theme of the old *Herald*, Lang warned in 1841 that the influx of Irish migrants would soon permit this interest to play off other parties against each other, and so ultimately to achieve independent power. Lang steadily maintained this crusade, especially in his attack on Caroline Chisholm's female migration schemes for allegedly 'extending the Romanism of the colony through the vile, Jesuistical, diabolical, system of "mixed marriages"'.³⁴

The *Sentinel* frequently accused Roman Catholics of employing or threatening physical force. Each St Patrick's Day, Boyne Day, and Guy Fawkes's Day, stories were told of plotting, intimidation, and disregard for the Processions Prevention Act. The Romans of Bathurst were said to have framed a charge of attempted murder against an innkeeper who allowed the celebration of 5 November on his premises. Ribbonism was active in Sydney, another article claimed, introducing an account of that movement's depredations in Ireland. The journal reported (22 July 1847) that a Protestant innkeeper had received the following message:

YOU ORANGE THIEF,

This is to caution you—you are watched, and will get that which you deserve. I caution you to be on your guard, for YOUR DOOM HAS BEEN PRONOUNCED.

The insignia of a coffin followed, bearing the innkeeper's initials and a skull and crossbones. 'Simple-minded Australians' were warned against dismissing the letter as a hoax.

The theology of Roman Catholicism also came under attack. Protestants were anxious to identify the Pope as 'the Man of Sin' and to represent the denial of private judgment and of the sufficiency of faith as tools of sacerdotal despotism. Not only black Ulstermen held such views: Robert Ross's denunciation of 'tyrannical priestly power' certainly rang sincere. Nevertheless the effect was to foment the sense of contempt on one side and persecution on the other.

Ultra-Protestants did not restrict their venom to the Church of Rome. Tractarians were no less an abomination. Lang once described Puseyism as 'even the worst of the two', while the Sconce-Makinson conversions led the *Sentinel* to criticize all forms of Catholicism without reserve. More surprisingly, the *Argus* and the *Sentinel* provided examples of anti-Semitism. The former implied that Romans and Jews united for political purposes; the latter attacked Judaism as a 'wretched system of theological monadism' and described a Mr Cohen, candidate for the Sydney corporation, as 'a foe to Christianity' supported by a 'cabal of Jews and infidels'.³⁵ Finally, ultra-Protestant literature criticized liberals who allied themselves with Roman Catholicism. Thus the *Sydney Protestant Magazine* bewailed that past persecution of this faith had 'attracted that sympathy which even merited suffering never fails in the end to call forth'. This sentiment had enabled Roman Catholics to persuade many that their Church no longer sought temporal power, to invoke charity and benevolence, and to use every other means 'to cry up the spurious liberality of the day'.³⁶ The *True Catholic* pursued a similar argument against 'false Liberality', especially when many citizens declined to subscribe because of the journal's anti-Romanism.³⁷ The *Sentinel* so abhorred the idea of a general cemetery (what decent man would want to lie buried beside a Catholic?) that it *joined* the Churches of England and Rome in opposing the measure. Again, it attacked the 'Illiberality of Religious Liberalism', with phrases which Nixon or Ullathorne might well have used:

any Christian Church, or any Christian man is fair game: they that revile and injure them really believe they are doing God service. Religion may be abused *ad libitum*, almost with impunity; but if a Christian writer dares to breathe one syllable opposed to the tyrannical creed of the school of indifferentism, instantly the cry rises 'Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live!' (11 Nov. 1847).

The desire to best Catholicism influenced Protestant attitudes generally. It encouraged voluntarism: James Forbes's main objection to state aid was that Romans and Tractarians obtained the lion's share; Lang swore his enmity to 'the present monstrous system of universal Church Establishment,—the main-stay of Popery and Puseyism and every other corrupt and apostate form of Christianity'.³⁸ Protestant unity owed much to antipathy to Rome: the *Sentinel* was eloquent in this cause. Conversely, John Morgan's behaviour in the Therry-Willson dispute was but an extreme instance of a common tactic—to excoriate differences within the Church in the hope of reducing its strength. Many Protestants, especially in New South Wales, shaped their attitudes to the education controversy in deliberate antithesis to Roman Catholic policy. So Broughton was able to unite all denominations against Bourke's plan of 1836: Saunders told the 1844 Education Committee that he co-operated simply because he suspected the current protagonists of the National system. Subsequently he, Lang, and many others supported that plan as the Roman Catholics moved against it.

The election of Melbourne's representative in the first Legislative Council, when Lang and William Kerr organized Henry Condell's campaign against Edward Curr, illustrated that sectarianism could adopt purely political terms. The history of both Melbourne and Sydney corporations had such overtones, and they probably affected contests for the legislature more often than the records tell. As the Processions Prevention Act recognized, physical force played some part: for a week around Boyne Day 1846 Melbourne suffered the tensions of civil war. Colonial presses republished Rebecca Reed's account of her horrific experiences and a lurid description of *Roman Catholic Morality* dredged from official documents. New South Wales had its own Rebecca Reed—one Agnes Byrne, who publicly denounced Roman Catholicism after having apostatized in the late thirties. When France seized Tahiti in 1844, protest meetings were held in both colonies; Protestant ministers were prominent, and detestation of Roman expansion a major theme of discussion.³⁹ Ardent Protestants were as guilty as some Roman Catholics in eschewing mutual philanthropy. In 1850 Hawksley alleged that sectarianism had invaded even the Sydney Benevolent Society, long regarded as a model of co-operation.

Protestantism as a Social Ethic

Lang stood first, but not alone, among Protestants who were also radicals. His letter-books witness that many correspondents agreed with him in both religion and politics. Thus A. M. Ramsay rejoiced that the gold-rushes had enabled thousands to 'have breathed for once the sweet air of liberty & they will never afterwards suffer themselves to be unjustly deprived of it. Australia will date her patriotism from this hour'.⁴⁰ Even among the most conservative group doctrinally—

orthodox Wesleyans—a parallel appeared. Boyce himself probably wrote an article in the *Christian Standard* which dismissed the past thirty years of British history as ‘*an age of little men and little measures*’: Parliamentary Reform, Free Trade, Emancipation, colonial self-government—none had gone nearly far enough.⁴¹ Among many similar comments Alexander Laurie’s eulogy of the French Revolution was outstanding:

principles in morals, in politics, and in human right were brought into contact with minds of masses of men. Government, political economy, and metaphysics, no longer the speculative amusement of the schools, or of the literary conversaziones of a luxurious aristocracy, became the theme of thought for the peasant and the artisan.⁴²

Laurie rejoiced that the ideas thus generated were securing recognition throughout the world.

If such attitudes were a necessary consequence of Protestantism, its disruptive quality would be potent indeed. In fact, no such logic prevailed, and many Protestants were hostile to radical ideas. That unbending Tory, John McGarvie, was at least as good a theologian as Lang; such models of Protestant orthodoxy as Henry Reed and Frederick Haller glorified their creeds as providing the best specific against any insubordination of class.⁴³ Temperamental factors doubtless often explained both a man’s religion and his politics; fighters for church equality and freedom from state control contributed to civil liberty—but beyond these generalizations no progress towards affirming an iron link between Protestantism and social-political radicalism is possible. But in so far as any religion emphasizes social ethic rather than salvation and eternity, so its authority diminishes over the faithful and—even more—those who might have remained faithful to a creed insistent on such matters. Thus its stress on secular morality provided a further sense in which colonial Protestantism contributed, if not to disruption, at least to the weakening of traditional bonds.

Several Protestant clerics warned against overemphasis on worldly benevolence. Frederick Miller condemned the many people who assented to the moral ordinances of Christianity without appreciating the need for a complete change of heart; McGarvie coupled the moralist with the artist, historian, and metaphysician as men who exaggerated the power of humanity to do good and avoid evil.⁴⁴ McGarvie had the logic to see that Broughton’s Church sided with such views far more solidly than his own did; privately he admitted that local Anglicanism formed ‘the only barrier agt. the inroads of popery and Practical Paganism’.⁴⁵ R. K. Ewing, an ex-Congregationalist who was Moderator of the Tasmanian Presbyterians in 1850-1, decried the labour many Christians felt impelled to contribute ‘in order to work out schemes of secular learning and philanthropic plans’.⁴⁶ These Protestants saw clearly the threat of secularism, but each felt the tide to be running against

him. Theologians such as Broughton would maintain that it was inevitable for Protestantism to succumb; once tradition and spiritual authority weakened, the lesser currency of religion must drive out the higher. Here again was a contention ultimately beyond proof. Nevertheless an empirical study of Australian experience supports the Broughton-Catholic view.

McGarvie and Ewing notwithstanding, the trend appeared particularly among Presbyterians. Calvinism often lost its harsher implications when preached from colonial pulpits. Thus Lang could describe *The True Glory of a Christian Church* without making any reference to predestination. Formal orthodoxy, he said, was 'a matter of very little consequence' compared with 'the formation of an intelligent, and virtuous, and Christian, population'.⁴⁷ The Reverend William Hamilton argued that justification through faith was 'a means employed by God to attain a greater end', namely 'man's advancement to a holy and heavenly character'; thus justification accelerated the drive to good works, rather than the opposite.⁴⁸ A newspaper once reported John Lillie as having

slighted the assertion which had been made, or insinuated, that the hopes of salvation of those belonging to his own communion depended on the uncovenanted mercies of God, and concluded by urging practical piety as the main thing, in comparison to which modes and ceremonies were of no importance.⁴⁹

Lillie's published works indicate that the journalist did not misrepresent his general argument. In his introductory sermon at Hobart he emphasized the need to recognize 'the essential connexion of religion with the well being and prosperity of society in the present life', and on another occasion declared that Nature was 'as truly the book of God, as the Bible'.⁵⁰

Presbyterians were remarkably zealous for Sabbath observance. Forbes described the Melbourne Sunday of 1849:

the youth strolls along the street, laughing, jesting, or whistling—rejoicing in his sin. Groups of idle females gather round the doors to retail the gossip of the week. Children let loose upon the streets, renew their week-day sports. Vehicles of all sorts wheel away out to the bush, conveying large parties bent on pleasure excursions. And what, in fine, is the Sabbath to the multitude in our large towns, but a day of recreation, mirth, and revelry?⁵¹

Such views as these, constantly repeated, reinforced Lang's dictum that Sunday observance was 'the best test of the moral and religious character of any people'.⁵² Consonant with this attitude was the Protestant emphasis on decorous behaviour, in every form and on any day, as the means to salvation. *A Discourse Upon Nonconformity to the World*

delivered in Hobart by Ernest Graff, a Presbyterian Sunday School teacher, indicted many human foibles with extraordinary righteousness.

John West proclaimed his concern for secular welfare:

religious men must no longer avoid the strife of the hustings as inconsistent with piety, or set the claims of religion in opposition to the obligation of the citizen. Both are in reality one; and while churches in their corporate capacity stand best when they are most distant from the arena of politics, it is the duty of all who reverence the Almighty's will and regard the welfare of mankind, to devote themselves to the social and political amelioration of society.⁵³

Alexander Morison, leading Independent minister in Melbourne before 1850, also linked 'amelioration' with religion in two sermons he gave during 1848 on Revelations, XVI, 12-16. The first pointed to signs of impending world crisis, among them the spread of aristocratic presumption, which had infected even Melbourne; the second demonstrated that the current French revolution heralded the Millennium. The world had yet to endure many troubles, but in some thirty years Christ would come again, to end tyranny and suffering. Barzillai Quaife preached on the same subject in Sydney in the same year. He believed that Christ would establish His kingdom through human instrumentality rather than personal intervention. Essentially spiritual, the new order would nevertheless affect every facet of life: 'hence the outward forms of society will undergo a vast and radical change . . . every government and political institution in actual existence will have to be either dissolved, or expurgated'.⁵⁴ Obviously Quaife, who contributed to the *People's Advocate*, and Morison were both political radicals.

Emphasis on social ethics came forward in the advocacy and practice of Protestant partnership. The Tasmanian Evangelical Union characteristically invoked 'obligations of brotherly love'.⁵⁵ West said that in country districts the itinerant minister, having a diverse audience, had to discard 'controversial divinity':⁵⁶ amorphous benevolence doubtless took its place. The Presbytery of Tasmania once issued a pastoral letter, which stressed that colonial believers were in a position different from home:

our Church meets on common ground with a variety of other Christian Churches, distinguished by all shades of difference, both in doctrine and polity, from our own; and out of this new position arise corresponding obligations. While you are on no account to concede or compromise what you believe to be truth, you are at the same time to cherish a spirit of Christian forbearance and charity. . . . And whenever you find those who entertain the same great principles of Christian doctrine, though they may differ from you in minor points, you are to sympathize and co-operate with them, in every good work.⁵⁷

The constant divisions within Protestantism did not show such sentiments to be meaningless. Probably self-will was rampant enough to cause still further splitting, had not brotherly love done its smoothing work. Contemporaries would have felt this to be so, and would therefore have called upon the remedy yet more insistently.

A by-way of Protestant Anglicanism offered the most piquant evidence that colonial conditions helped secularize Christianity. In 1836 there appeared from Sydney a volume entitled *The Language of Theology Interpreted*. . . . Its author, G. M. C. Bowen, was an ex-officer, settler, and magistrate who had determined to enter the Anglican ministry and wished to explain his beliefs to Broughton. Bowen was a hyper-generous Arminian. He believed that the day would soon come 'when the single and universal passion among men shall be a constant burning desire to increase the amount of human happiness'; the Scriptures were a giant parable rather than literal truth: no hell of physical torment existed, but only alienation from the will of God. Predestination, with its corollaries that not all men would be saved and God might reject a repentant sinner, implied 'either a want of power or a want of benevolence in the Heavenly Parent'.⁵⁸ Bowen believed his theology justified by the tremendous material progress in New South Wales. Conventional Anglicans were aghast: H. T. Stiles refused Bowen communion (even when he came and knelt at the altar-rail); Broughton tried to compromise but finally had to support Stiles.

The climax of the argument that Protestants became absorbed in social ethics must be to suggest that their faith, or at least important strains within it, turned into moral enlightenment. Did Protestant attitudes to education and Temperance confirm this? Any judgment on education is difficult if the Protestants' own assumptions are accepted. Broughton and McEncroe thought that general education must damage Christianity, Ross and Saunders did not; Henry Carmichael, who believed that children should be given no theological teaching (in his school the Bible was available only 'as a book of reference, and voluntary perusal; its lessons of wisdom and morality will be turned to as affording rules for the guidance of life'), would have maintained that he served the best interests of Christianity.⁵⁹ However, Lillie once spoke of the 'sacrifice' made by Presbyterians in not seeking to establish their own schools. When taken up by R. R. Davies, an Anglican minister, Lillie re-emphasized the evil of animosities created by denominational education and denied that he had forsaken any Christian principle. But the apologia was awkward, and Davies must have felt confident of victory.⁶⁰ Heterodoxy again hovered when the *Christian Standard* linked the progress of adult education with 'the motto of our progressing Christianity . . . "Behold I make ALL THINGS new"'.⁶¹

The Synod of Australia advised its members to speak against drunkenness at every opportunity. Carrying out this injunction, William Hamilton described the habit as 'a sin which extensively prevails in this colony,

which leads to the commission of many of the other sins that disgrace it, and which hinders, perhaps more than any other cause, the success of those means which are employed to diffuse religious knowledge, and extend the practice of true religion'.⁶² A. M. Ramsay believed that God punished the prevalence of this 'sin' in Melbourne by inflicting a violent storm upon the city. Hundreds of such statements indicated that Protestantism offered at least ground in which the seeds of moral enlightenment could germinate. Many Protestants—some active in their religious observances, some careless—certainly helped its growth. But the new faith was more than a shoot from the old.

PART THREE

A New Faith: Moral Enlightenment

THE FAITH, THE MIND, AND THE PSYCHE

Moral Enlightenment in Brief

FREDERICK MAITLAND INNES, Premier of Tasmania from 1872 to 1873, first came to the island in the thirties. His long career touched many aspects of colonial life, journalism particularly. Among the papers he edited was the *Tasmanian*, for which on 4 January 1839 he adopted a new editorial text. It comprised two sentences from the American Transcendentalist, Ellery Channing (1780-1842): 'I know no wisdom but that which reveals man to himself, and which teaches him to regard all social institutions, and his whole life as the means of unfolding and exalting the spirit within him. All policy which does not recognise this truth, seems to me shallow.' The Transcendentalist creed could not have found neater expression. More verbose but more interesting was Innes's explanation of why he had selected a text from Channing:

he stands nearly at the head of that rapidly increasing class of political reasoners who exalt principle above expediency in weighing the counsels of nations; and who consider nothing gained, if at the expense of virtue, even though apparently directed towards its promotion—*Fiat Justitia, ruat caelum*, would be their motto, if they could bring themselves to believe that Justice and Heaven are ever in opposition. But they take higher ground, for they contend that only by Justice can Heaven be attained,—or in other words, that the Just is always the Expedient. They resort, accordingly, to moral principles on all occasions of doubt, not to a balance of apparently conflicting utilities; and truly Catholic alike in their views and faith, they contend that what it is right to do, it is also desirable for all interests concerned to have done. . . .

It is very remarkable how often in reasoning the extremes of dissent meet at length in assent. One man goes East around the world, and another West; but they encounter as they advance, and then traverse, each the other's former steps. Thus the political faith of the Utilitarians, and of the sect whom we describe, but who have as yet no distinctive name, are theoretically wide as the Poles asunder;—yet do they coalesce in their results on more points than almost any other two denominations of political thinkers. Both appeal to first principles,—the one to find the useful, whence they deduce the right,—the other to find the right, whence they deduce the useful. And their agreement is one of the strongest arguments that can be adduced in favour of

the strict alliance between the principles of which they respectively assert the supremacy.

Morally, Metaphysically, and Religiously there can be no question which of them is rigorously right;—but practically, as but too often happens, those who are not morally, metaphysically, religiously or rigorously right,—in other words, whose standard is a low one, are yet the more successful disputants, and in smaller matters the readier guides. A utility lies on the surface, while a moral principle is hidden deep below it; and a very ordinary intelligence will discover the one, while the other may not be comprehended by it, even if disinterred.

It is in combination, rather than in antithesis, that each of the theories which we have thus described is seen to greatest advantage; and their essential union, however they may appear occasionally to differ, is happily the creed of both the parties who maintain them. No sane Utilitarian sees usefulness, in the sense which he attaches to the word, in crime; and the loftiest (sane) Moralist sees no virtue in avowedly useless refinement. As already observed, they set off to circumnavigate the political globe in opposite directions, but their courses eventually coalesce. They do not head in the same direction, but they equally make for the same Port. Happy the Statesman who reaches that Port, by whichever Pilot guided, and who finds his search for usefulness end in virtue, or his search for virtue end in usefulness. And happy the People whose Ruler is indeed persuaded that the perfection of each may be tested by such identity.

Charles Harpur (1813-68) was another admirer of the Transcendentalists, the supreme theorist of the new faith in Australia, and coiner of the phrase 'moral enlightenment'. Born in Australia of ex-convict parents, he strove to universalize his thought and work. Thus in his notebooks many poems are prefaced by explanatory essays, often more interesting than the verse itself. This applied with particular force to the ode 'Finality', which appeared in the *Atlas* in 1847. Harpur showed his own awareness of the essay's significance by later publishing it separately in Parkes's *Empire*. It ran, in part:

when Rousseau desiderated the savage state as the noblest for man, he was wrong. But he was led into the error by the partial perception of a great truth: namely, that the best condition for the development of the full majesty of man, were one in which the personal freedom and sovereignty of savage life should co-exist with all the artistic beneficences and moral security of civilized society. And such a condition is indeed the great end of all human community—is social individualization, the finality of the future.

And education and social individualization should also be infinitely more than they are—the finality of the present; in other words, a teaching and employing process by which every individual might be improved to the full extent and according to the specific character of his capacity. This is demanded by a new and singular (self-sustained and sustaining) order of consciousness, which is fast developing itself in the whole human race. All the great political, social and religious

interests that were originally only operant as motive powers upon men in bodies or nationally, are beginning to centre and manifest themselves in Man the individual. Centuries of thought and self-investigation—the experience for good and evil of entire races;—these, in effect, are becoming constitutionally accumulated, and additionally transmissive, in single individuals.

Hence the 'greatest good of the greatest number' is *not* a final principle of human community, and is fast giving place to another that *is*: namely, *the greatest good to each and all*. Hence, too, men can no longer be the creatures of Governments; these can no longer mould them characteristically into masses; because the association tendencies of all are beginning to cognise and perfect their end in each. Even the Austrian—even the thinking Russian can now grow up under the thundrous shadow of his paternal despotism, with a distinct personal consciousness of inherent independence—of the self-possession of spiritual prerogatives which reduce it, even in its apparent almightiness, to a mere temporal accident: and he can dare to look it in the face therefore, as being a thing only,—an awful one indeed, but which, as a person,—as a man, he has a right to question.

And as this Individualizing process grows natively out of the Past, it cannot be arrested. It should be carried forward then; and for this to be done harmoniously, individual education upon the most liberal and adaptative scale must be speedily resorted to; so that all men, having progressed beyond the state-legislation contemporaneously obtaining, may become more and more, to the destined extent,—each and all of them, Governments in themselves (30 June 1851).

Similar ideas pervaded a *Herald* editorial of January 1849:

The present . . . is a great era. In this respect it is similar to the sixteenth century. The same revulsion against spiritual and political tyranny, the same craving for novelties of thought, of word, and of deed, of action, declaration, and speculation; the same spirit of awakened enterprise, warlike and commercial, the same outcry and necessity for organic and social changes in old and settled countries; the same attractions to colonists from . . . unpopulated countries, the same aspirings, but more widely felt and better directed, for contributing personal efforts and private means to the improvement of the human race. . . .

These three passages described the new faith. It arose on foundations laid by the *philosophes* and reinforced by Jeremy Bentham—individualism, rationality, man's power to control his environment, the need for reform, the concept of progress. But Romantic, not Utilitarian, principles shaped the ideology's superstructure. The quest for perfection became the keynote: man should cast off all vice, stupidity, and selfishness as he created an earthly Utopia. This was the chief end of existence, its achievement demanding the sacrifice of all other considerations. Every person could and must join in this advance. Stress on Everyman's participation and on moral rectitude forged strong links with Protestantism. In

Britain Evangelicals rather than Nonconformists had been the Protestant standard-bearers in this alliance. William Wilberforce helped shape moral enlightenment as much as did Bentham.

Upholders of the doctrine necessarily had a simple and optimistic view of humanity. 'A large faith in the capacity of human nature for good, is the root of all genuine morality',¹ wrote Harpur; while John Lillie, in whom the new faith fought hard but decisively against the old, contended that 'truth and justice and goodness are essentially and unalterably congenial to the rational and moral apprehensions'.² An angry cry repudiated the suggestion of one colonial philosopher that all acts, however benevolent in appearance, arose from self-interest.³

Thus the cold, academic qualities of Utilitarianism swept off on a torrent of Romantic fervour. The concept that some might have to suffer pain to advance the pleasure of others was rationalized away; so too, as Innes emphasized, any contradiction between material and spiritual advance. An alternative title for the new faith would be 'the Enlightenment Transcendentalized'. Why did contemporaries not agree on a designation? To some, simple 'liberalism' provided the right meaning, while others lacked the ability to disentangle the leading ideas of so eclectic a creed. Certainly it was, and remains, hard to dissect and define.

Appeal to the Mind: Culture

From its foundation to the present, men have argued that culture has unique power to dissolve the ills which beset Australia's development. This view never prevailed more strongly than in the mid-nineteenth century, its advocates (like those of orthodox radicalism) belatedly expressing overseas trends. Movements for adult education and the dissemination of knowledge, George Birkbeck and Henry Brougham in the lead, had become intense in the tempestuous Britain of the late twenties and early thirties. By an Act of 1833 Parliament at last began to provide funds for general primary education. Many American states, France, and Prussia were far ahead in such work, and colonists did not hesitate to draw examples from them. Australian historians have maintained this enthusiasm of their forefathers and so have provided a comparative wealth of pertinent studies. The most imaginative and acute of these—*Australia's Colonial Culture* by G. H. Nadel—deliberately examines the concept that the diffusion of knowledge should act as both key-stone and cement of society.

The foundation of this idea was confidence that learning made men good. One of the few locally-printed (although not locally-written) school books from this period had a chapter devoted to 'Improvement of the Mind'. The summary ran:

Great end of knowledge,—not worldly advantage,—not merely to get on,—not mere gratification,—not display,—but to make us happier and better,—to do good to others,—to lead to God.⁴

The advance of education, whatever its level, appeared in this light. At Hobart in 1835 an Infant Schools society heard that nineteen crimes out of twenty were 'committed in order to obtain the means of gratifying the dissipated and bad passions of our nature, which it is the object of Infant Schools to subdue';⁵ Wentworth advocated the Sydney University Bill of 1849 by declaring that 'this measure—this which is to enlighten the mind, to refine the understanding, to elevate the soul of our fellow men; . . . this I believe will live—live to commemorate the Council who passed it'.⁶ The *Colonial Literary Journal*—eminent among the magazines which strove to vanquish barbarism—constantly stressed the value of learning to the individual, just as a Wesleyan might expound personal salvation. 'The reward which the man of letters obtains for all his labours, is, a soul free from vulgar fears and prejudices, a comprehensive and cultivated mind full of inexhaustible stores of entertainment and reflection, a perpetual spring of fresh ideas, and the conscious dignity of superior intelligence.'⁷ Such a man would never suffer from worldly disappointment, but would achieve serene content.

More often culture appealed as the source of communal rather than personal beatitude. Duncan's argument that education must provide the tie which political or religious tradition supplied in the old world had wide currency: a contributor to the *Colonial Literary Journal* summoned Harpur to come forth 'as the guiding star of his countrymen in the glorious and soul-elevating paths of literature,—of a literature NATIONAL and Australian, for if it be worthy . . . the terms are synonymous!'⁸ The poet was alert to such a call, and later bewailed his compatriots' deafness to 'the Lyre of Australia'. Editors of literary journals felt a similar mission—not only to refine society, but to encourage the sense of nationality.

Formal education was vital to this development. The description, 'National', of general schools in New South Wales had so obvious and important a symbolism that upholders of denominationalism protested against it. A report issued by the Mechanics' Institute at Sydney thus judged its own place in destiny:

the results of the diffusion of knowledge among the human family, and the moral and intellectual improvement of the day, are far outstripping the calculations of the philosopher or the statesman. Sound and cheap education is the great moral lever. The schoolmaster's ferule has superseded the warrior's sword. Society must now be led, not driven. In accomplishing thus far this great work, Mechanics' Institutions, and kindred societies, have in no small measure assisted.⁹

As early as 1837 the Hobart *Courier* urged that superior education flourish lest 'our national (Colonial) character . . . eventually be one of rustic boorishness, and impenetrable ignorance';¹⁰ many praised Sydney University for enabling Australian natives to train as philosopher-kings of their country.

The affection for non-denominational education sprang largely from the belief that it would melt all disharmony away. 'Which is the nobler, purer, feeling', demanded Robert Lowe, the supreme advocate for National schools, 'to adopt the intended system of social enlightenment, or to encourage the splitting up of the community into sectarian parties?'¹¹ Political divisions too would evaporate under the new dispensation, as all factional self-seeking became obsolete. The culturists demanded social change, but they were confident that human intelligence would achieve this result without upheaval. Learning established its own forms of social control, far more just and no less effective than the old. Classes would remain, but movement between them depend on intellectual merit. Lillie already saw a hint of this Millennium in British politics. 'The tory of former days is all but extinct', he told the Hobart Institute, over which he presided for many years, 'while the modern conservative, who occupies his place, is so essentially changed . . . that he would have been recognized by the former rather as a foe than a friend.'¹²

The desire to harness politics to learning prompted Richard Windeyer and others to advocate an 'academic' franchise. Windeyer suggested to the 1844 franchise committee that some supervisory board should issue a diploma, carrying the right to vote, to all men educated to a specified level. 'If it should be said that this might end in universal suffrage', he argued, 'my answer is, that if there were universal enlightenment there would be no danger in universal suffrage.'¹³ The committee sought the opinion of other witnesses, most of whom were favourable, and itself tentatively endorsed the idea. Though impracticable, the scheme well expressed the temper of the new faith. Historians often trace the introduction of free, secular, and compulsory education to the legislators' wish to 'educate their masters', but their argument crudifies the link between universal education and political democracy.

This context further explains why culturists stressed the need to contact all men. Denominational schools were out of favour because they not only encouraged sectarian feeling but made the provision of an all-embracing system far more difficult. Compulsion was still objectionable to the liberal conscience as expressed, for example, by the 1844 education committee. But Duncan early moved to the opposite position, and in 1848 this view received further support from a pseudonymous pamphleteer, who scorned 'the *liberty* which an ignorant and unnatural parent may claim to withhold from his child the blessings of education', and questioned 'whether this liberty is entitled to the consideration of a right either on natural or social grounds'.¹⁴ The *Atlas* reviewer agreed.

The Act establishing Sydney University repeated the concern for universality. The legislators did not explain how poor men could attend a fee-paying university, but other friends of culture hoped to fill the gap with mechanics' institutes. These developed not only in the capitals, but also at Launceston, Geelong, Newcastle, Bathurst, Portland, Parramatta, Maitland, Ipswich, Singleton, Goulburn, and probably even smaller

towns. In addition, the drapers' assistants of Sydney launched an improvement society in 1843 (it later became the Commercial Reading Room, then Bellingham's Reading Room), and so did their Hobart counterparts in 1848. Sometimes these bodies were mere discussion circles, akin to many less pretentious gatherings; sometimes, lending libraries for those already educated; but on occasion they did strive towards a missionary purpose. The Reverend Charles Price, a leader of the Launceston institute, characteristically stressed the need to overcome all social divisions:

the intellectual nature of the working classes demands improvement. It has commenced, and will go forward in spite of all opposition. It is determined to tread down the already mouldering traditions in law and science, and religion, by which the working classes have been kept in the prison house of ignorance, grinding for the pampered few.¹⁵

Already the Launceston body had sought to attract the workers' interest by throwing open its lectures without charge; at Hobart, a specified number of operatives sat on the managing committee, while special subscription rates applied to their fellows. The bigger institutes provided evening classes with a defined programme and scope. An ambitious, unsuccessful plan on these lines began in Sydney in 1844: over three years a student would survey mathematics, physics, chemistry, English language, and political economy.

Price's statement represented a great number of attacks on privilege—always deplorable, according to liberal philosophy, but especially so when pertaining to culture. Thus among the protests directed against the Gell-Franklin College was a petition which sneered at its proposed 'monastic system' of residence; this might suit the hereditary aristocracy of England, but had little relevance to the 'usefulness and respectability' of hard-working colonists.¹⁶ In 1844 J. D. Lang denounced the exclusive tone of the Australian Library. At a general meeting called in consequence, Lang attacked the executive, castigating especially the ballot for members. Only the Roman Catholic liberals supported him at all; the respectability's coldness probably hastened his progress to the political left. A few months later Lang again alleged privilege when he objected to the Sydney Institute receiving £200 from the government, while its rural counterparts went unaided. In Hobart the Protestant-liberal *Colonial Times* joined with the *Hobarton Guardian* to abuse clique-control of the Institute, the public library (established 1849), and other aspects of the city's cultural life.

In the welter of argument on education many advanced ideas found expression. Quotations from European reformers, especially J. H. Pestalozzi and P. E. von Fellenberg, often decried parrot learning, and upheld the need to train a child's whole character and mental processes. Corporal punishment appeared as a symbol of a cold, cruel order which all aspired to replace. The education of up-country children prompted much inquiry, the most favoured technique being the establishment of boarding

schools, where students could learn, *inter alia*, agricultural skills. The grant of power to the National Schools Board to create industrial schools also showed awareness of the need for vocational training. Tasmanian state schools operated lending libraries which both pupils and their parents used. Some educationists already believed that girls should have opportunities equal to their brothers. The Hobart Town High School broke away from traditional English curricula.

Men of great ability worked in the field. In Tasmania from 1850 the Inspector of Schools was Thomas Arnold, son of the great Rugbeian and no less devoted than his kindred to the problems of education. Arnold's counterpart in Port Phillip was H. C. E. Childers, already displaying the quality which led him to a Cabinet post under Gladstone. G. W. Rusden, historian and *littérateur*, played a crucial part in the early years of the New South Wales National Board. The original appointee as rector of Hobart High was the philosopher and historian J. A. Froude; following his withdrawal the post descended to James Eccleston, a leading figure in the English College of Preceptors and a believer in the 'almost godlike power' of his profession. He was to die within a few weeks of taking office. Other outstanding pedagogues were T. W. Cape, Henry Carmichael, James Forbes, and William Wilkins.

Many teachers strove to improve the status of their profession. In mid-1847 a pioneer organization petitioned the New South Wales legislature to appoint a board for the issue of diplomas. Three years later teachers in Sydney formed the Professional Literary Association, which sponsored that excellent magazine, the *Australian Era*. Among its best articles was 'Education in New South Wales' by Edward Reeve. Teachers, he complained, enjoyed neither proper respect nor proper remuneration, and so had little chance to impress learning and discipline upon their pupils; parents interfered with matters which rightly belonged to the teacher alone; children moved from school to school, rendering hopeless any systematic approach.

The early career of James Bonwick best illustrated the ideals and practice of the finest teachers. Trained at the British and Foreign Society's school in London, Bonwick and his wife and five other couples were recruited to carry their skill to Tasmania. Having arrived at Hobart late in 1841, Bonwick soon found qualities to admire in colonial society, where 'men of varied and even conflicting views mingled in discussion', so creating 'a livelier spirit of enquiry' than he had known in England.¹⁷ He at once took charge of a model school under government auspices. To all his scholars Bonwick taught arithmetic, mensuration, music, geography, geometry, and natural history; older pupils touched history, natural philosophy, and French. At the end of 1842 he advertised for private pupil-boarders who would learn the duty of man to his neighbour and 'especially, that knowledge of the nature of their own minds and bodies, which may lead to the preservation of health, control of thought, and

rectitude of conduct'.¹⁸ Educated an Anglican, and thereafter moving freely between Baptists, Quakers, and Independents, Bonwick imparted as much Scriptural knowledge as he could without impinging on the Sacraments, the Apostles' Creed, or the Ten Commandments.¹⁹ This latitudinarianism did not endear him to Loch and Fry, when they investigated his school while campaigning against the British and Foreign system; nevertheless they did remark, in condescending praise, that 'the order of the children in this School was very remarkable, and the discipline of the Schoolmaster of a very peculiar nature'.²⁰

The enquiry heightened Bonwick's discontent with the public service and in 1844 he launched a private boarding school, named Hofwyl House after the Swiss institution where von Fellenberg applied Pestalozzi's principles. Press notices remarked on the fine equipping of this school, its cleanliness and ample playing-space, and especially the vigour of its public examinations, altogether free from the much-spurned 'merely mechanical process'. In 1845 issued the first substantial product from Bonwick's pen, a *Geography for the Use of Australian Youth*, which spoke the unalloyed language of moral enlightenment. Through the rest of his long life Bonwick wrote many such works, as well as opening up research into Australian archives. A study of the distribution and use of his books might indicate that no man had greater influence in propagating the new faith.

* * *

Bonwick's repudiation of mind-packing reflected a common belief that imagination must infuse reason. The question was delicate, for many culturists feared lest imagination rampant might inflame those gross passions which it was one of the purposes of learning to subdue. So the *Australian Era* denounced the 'garbage' of European novelists as a potent influence towards criminality, while the *Illustrated Australian Magazine* characterized the confirmed novel-reader as a 'mental drunkard', whose ever-growing appetite for fiction would extinguish all desire for other, more lofty, pursuits. The same outlook prompted abuse of the popular theatre and of the dominance of fiction in public libraries. Unchecked, this attitude could lead to a narrow, negative moralism, directly contrary to Transcendentalism.

Harpur was the most forthright spokesman of the imagination school. He averred that his 'high and sacred' muse sought to impress mankind by appealing to the passions rather than to reason; these 'elements of human life' could inspire as well as degrade. Making these points Harpur defended himself against ministers of religion, not apostles of education. His attitude did not imply any lessening of his wish to improve humanity—rather it sought new ways of doing so. This, he felt, was a poet's task: Shelley, for all his brilliance, lacked that sense of 'solid humanity' essential to perfection.²¹

Few other culturists faced up to this issue as squarely as did Harpur, preferring to confuse the appeals to the mind and to the imagination. So the fine arts were approved without restraint, despite their consanguinity with fiction and drama. Music was particularly esteemed. Several institutes started choral groups, and no aspect of their work had greater success. The *Australian* believed that a music school could do much 'to elevate the mind and refine the manners of the people'; the *Colonial Times* used similar words when welcoming a new choir in Hobart.²² The finest musician then resident in Australia, Isaac Nathan, expounded his belief in the power of music to define men's social duty and the evils of materialism.

Painting enjoyed comparable prestige. It too had the blessing of some institutes, and along with 'The Philanthropist', 'The Temperance Advocate', and 'The Poet', an artist was featured in a lively Sydney journal, *Heads of the People*. J. S. Prout, a gifted water-colourist, shared Nathan's concern for the diffusion of taste and high ideals. Bookshops—shrines of culture in every community—added to their charms by sponsoring 'art unions'—lotteries, the capital from which bought works of art for distribution among the winners. Artists began to organize, and to improve public appreciation. Residents of the major towns occasionally could attend exhibitions, comprising local work and loans from private collections. In opening such a display John West argued that the perusal of great works could 'diminish the power of meaner gratifications', and continued:

every addition to the intellectual amusement of the day is a new guarantee for the morrow. The youthful visitor will return with his views increased, and his notions more distinct; he will feel a new interest in his race, and a full consciousness of its mental dignity; dissipation will be resisted, not only by the warnings of authority, but by the instinct of taste.²³

Even public building entered the culturists' service. If men were to become aware of themselves as civilized, intelligent beings, said an *Australian Era* article on 'The Australasian Metropolis', intelligence and civility must pervade their environment; this ideal was spreading in Britain, where many towns possessed baths, wash-houses, parks, and playgrounds. The writer urged the local administration to abandon its catchpenny policies and to erect buildings in the admiration of which all classes might join, thereby diverting the drive towards 'sensual desire and sensual gratification'. The neatly-planned streets of Melbourne ought to have appealed to this frame of mind, but an article in the *Australasian* magazine suggested the reverse. The writer bemoaned that the 'panel-system' made no provision for a civic square which could serve as commercial focus and aesthetic inspiration. The assumption that architecture affected character received an interesting twist from a critic who praised the High School as 'the architectural glory' of Tasmania. He

found significance in its Elizabethan style—‘a symbol of the large mindedness, enterprise, and earnestness of purpose pertaining to the days of mental emancipation; when the Gothic passed away with darkness and superstition, of which it was an appropriate but fantastic emblem’.²⁴

The concept of ‘physical culture’ grew steadily. While fisticuffs and duels were condemned as anti-rational and therefore vicious, other sports won the accolade of the new faith. As headmaster of Sydney College, T. H. Braim encouraged physical prowess; a club formed to organize the Victorian Gymnastic Games, in celebration of Port Phillip’s separation, professed interest solely in activity which employed ‘the noble faculties of mind’; the *Australasian Sporting Magazine* spoke against materialism and crudity, precisely as did the literary periodicals. Swimming had its devotees, most notably N. L. Kentish, a versatile exponent of moral enlightenment. His *Sydney Times* often praised this exercise not only for purifying the mind but also for cleansing the body—a factor which, as the *Australian Era*’s praise of baths and wash-houses showed, apostles of the new faith kept well in mind. In doing so they strove again to bring the workingman to respectability.

Gardening and farming were other physical pursuits which the culturists ranked high. The ‘Nathan’ of gardening was Daniel Bunce, of Hobart and later Melbourne, whose *Manual* lauded the craft as ‘combining, more than any other, health, recreation, profit, information and innocent enjoyment’.²⁵ The Hobart Town Horticultural Society was the precursor of the Royal Society of Van Diemen’s Land, the outstanding learned body in the colonies. The *Australian* included a floral and agricultural society and the Hunter River Agricultural Society among the ‘liberal’ associations of New South Wales, in company with the Mechanics’ Institute and the Australian Library. This connexion appeared again in the name of the Australian Society for Encouragement of Arts, Science, Commerce and Agriculture, founded at Sydney in 1850.

This title suggested a further element in the new faith—interest in science and confidence in its efficacy to transform all things. Science was culture. The institutes symbolized the union in their efforts to develop museums and laboratories as well as reading-rooms and libraries; to provide lectures in zoology, botany, physics, and chemistry, as well as in literature and art. The curricula of Hobart High and Sydney University (especially as first planned) reflected the same trend. Well before either of these institutions commenced, the *Courier* had remarked:

the improving spirit of the times has distinguished itself in nothing more than the reform it has introduced into the old systems of scholastic and collegiate education. The useful is gradually ingrafting itself on the abstract. Science, the natural associate, but long alienated helpmate of literature, is gradually coming by the voice of common sense in all our most approved places of instruction, into closer alliance (5 Feb. 1836).

The *New South Wales Magazine* carried the sub-title 'Journal of General Politics, Literature, Science, and the Arts'; the editor's address to the public touched upon all the leading features of the new faith, and linked literature and science as the two great fields in which all colonists could join to 'Advance Australia'.

Many personal ties bound science with other aspects of moral enlightenment. Lillie was secretary of the Royal Society as well as president of the Mechanics' Institute and (after Eccleston's death) temporary rector of the High School. William Bland was not only a whig and a philanthropist but also an eminent surgeon who developed a technique for bypassing ligatures and blood vessels during an operation. He suggested how to curb fires in ships carrying wool, and built a model of an 'atmotic' airship, which would cut down the Australia-England journey to a few days. A regular contributor to the first *Australian Medical Journal* was W. R. Pugh of Launceston; like Bland he was a philanthropist, an innovator in medicine (pioneering the most dramatic advance of these years, the administration of ether), and an inventor (preparing his own drugs and experimenting with gas illumination). N. L. Kentish claimed to have resolved the secret of perpetual motion and to be able to apply his knowledge to ocean-going vessels.²⁶ Charles Price supplemented his spiritual and secular good works with various scientific interests, including telegraphy and the application of galvanic batteries to medical complaints.

The great contribution of science to moral enlightenment was to strengthen belief in progress. The attention given to improved medical techniques, especially the use of ether, was the natural response of a creed which so emphasized human, temporal happiness. But the steam engine enthralled the culturists still more. For Lillie the discovery of this power marked 'an era in the history of our species . . . working a mighty revolution in the social and economical condition of the world'.²⁷ This remark came from a lecture which postulated that scientific discoveries would realize the gospel ideals of unity and fraternal love. Odd though this might sound, it was quite typical. While Lillie and others were glorifying steam, some already looked to electricity as the hope of the world—most explicit among them W. R. Wade, a former Baptist missionary and the salaried officer of the Mechanics' Institute in Hobart. For the editor of the *Australian Era* the wonders of both telegraphy and steam travel proved his magazine's guiding principle—'MIND shall work out the physical regeneration of the human race'.²⁸

His emphasis was appropriate: communications seemed all-important to many commentators and attracted inventors other than Bland and Kentish. One exhibit from New South Wales at the 1851 Exhibition was Sir Thomas Mitchell's device to apply a boomerang propeller to steamships; a Sydney engineer named John Curr calculated the optimum size of working-parts in a steam engine, so hoping to facilitate passage by rail and sea; several inventors applied themselves to ballooning and

heavier-than-air flight. Improved communications were hailed as likely to answer Australia's most pressing problems—distance from Europe and lack of inland waterways. Space and time would shrink in a near-miraculous way, adding years to the life-span of mankind. Above all, better communications would help in the transmission of ideas, and so would stimulate men to attempt to solve all problems:

they are binding together the whole human race into one nation, into one family. They are doing more to put an end to the barbarous practice of war, and spread the arts of peace and civilization over the whole surface of the globe, than has ever yet been done by all the philosophers. . . . The interchange of sentiments and opinions and practices that is now taking place between the inhabitants of the old and new worlds, through the successful establishment of a steam-bridge across the Atlantic—the action and reaction produced by the natural and daily exhibition of the social improvements of the one continent, and the civil and religious liberty of the other—is undoubtedly the most interesting phenomenon of the age. . . .²⁹

This supposed power of a common culture to secure universal peace had a strong appeal. George Arden, littérateur and journalist, reinforced it by forecasting the day when men would produce weapons so horrible as to preclude all thought of war.³⁰

The *Colonial Literary Journal* once remarked that the best promise for 'improvement in the tempers and in the manners of the people' lay in 'the magic efforts of that mighty engine, the Press'.³¹ 'Engine' had a literal meaning, for among steam's glories was its role in the cheap dissemination of literature. Improvements in postal communications conduced to the same end. Thus a New South Wales Act of 1850, which followed the British penny post example, deeply impressed William Westgarth, most intelligent disciple of the new faith in early Melbourne.

Though concerned primarily with the mind, and hostile to crude avarice, moral enlightenment did not spurn the economic and physical aspects of prosperity. A man degraded by poverty was dead to the message of any faith, old or new; a creed which depended so much on the concept of progress could not but approve individual and collective wellbeing. 'In this age of wonders, nothing new in the material, mental, or moral world ought to excite astonishment', said the *Examiner*,³² epitomizing this interdependence. Moreover, the achievements of industry and commerce encouraged free trade and so universal peace: the 1851 Exhibition won the *Australian Era's* applause as well as the *Herald's*, and inspired the establishment in Victoria of an industrial society concerned to develop both cultural and economic resources. Upholders of the new faith were anxious that Australia should participate in what the *Australia Felix Monthly Magazine* called

the natural progress of nations . . . from the prairie and the forest to the city and the town, the roaming flock gradually receding before

the plough, the shepherd and stockman before the husbandman and artizan, the hut of the rural proprietor making way for the palace of the merchant prince, or the stores and buildings of the manufacturer.³³

Hence sprang the culturist antipathy to squatting, and also the high place accorded agriculture. Within one year the *Port Phillip Magazine* published articles on land drainage, meat processing, tobacco culture, and the adaptability of Peruvian sheep to Australian conditions; literary men joined entrepreneurs in praising Ludwig Leichhardt. And what of the gold discoveries? Perhaps this passage best expressed the reaction of moral enlightenment:

we may expect . . . an immense diffusion of mankind under circumstances highly favourable to the production of physical comfort. . . . We believe that the time will come when unskilled labour will be superseded by mechanical inventions—when men, enjoying in rich abundance the bounties of nature, will be employed in the grateful application of its principles to the development of the useful and the beautiful, accompanied by a practical carrying out of christian principles, of which the beauty is now acknowledged while their authority is too often disregarded.³⁴

Again science appeared as the herald of Utopia.

In 1841 the Sydney Institute taught zoology, cosmology, physics, peritropology (the study of change), and 'Anthropology or Man Study'. The last revealed an awareness of the value of investigating human relations and behaviour; that is, of social science. The council of Hobart High decided to build right in the city, partly to encourage pupils to observe society at work and so to become better equipped to act for its welfare. The *Atlas* had earlier professed its care to discover the laws governing human behaviour, and to enquire into the mechanism of politics, the shaping of public opinion, and the operation of interests. 'It is as if Political Economy were being acted on a stage', declared one editorial that stressed the suitability of local conditions for such an enquiry, 'for in a colony we may witness *the growth* of human society as plainly as we can observe the operations of bees through a glass hive.'³⁵

To people of such mind the aborigines invited action. John Lhotsky adopted quite sophisticated techniques to extract information from William Buckley concerning the tribes among whom he lived for thirty years;³⁶ and Alexander Maconochie applied to Bourke for a position in Port Phillip in order to investigate the culture clash of Europeans and aborigines. The problem posed by these unhappy people evoked reactions which showed that moral enlightenment did not lead all men to the same conclusion. Lowe and Archibald Michie despised a people they believed deficient in intelligence; another writer of similar outlook urged 'Coercive Education and Employment'; yet another applauded 'the extinction of unimproved humanity', while wanting their death to be as

comfortable as possible.³⁷ Richard Windeyer was benevolent enough to persuade the legislature to consider the aboriginal problem. Harpur and his fellow-poet Henry Halloran deplored the atrocities of European behaviour, while Bonwick's textbook described the aborigines as 'for savages, a very harmless, happy race of people . . . rendered ferocious and blood-thirsty by the treatment they received'.³⁸ Several journalists and especially Westgarth adopted a more modern attitude: western civilization only harmed these people and should not be allowed to disrupt their tribal life.

Westgarth was the outstanding sociological thinker of the colonies. With Ralph Mansfield and a few others he pioneered the collection of social statistics, a study which the *New South Wales Magazine* applauded as prominent among 'those practical sciences which have an immediate bearing on the improvement of mankind'.³⁹ That Westgarth himself thought on these lines appeared in an address he wrote for the Mechanics' Institute at Melbourne. This urged the study—not only for their own sake, but as affecting society—of history, religion, law, and the mechanism of the human mind. In the last category Westgarth emphasized phrenology. No other social science attracted such attention in the colonies, nor was more significant.

Appeal to the Psyche: Phrenology and Mesmerism

A characteristic element of modern European thought has been the urge to explain motives and personality in terms of factors open to test and control. Two Viennese physicians, F. J. Gall (1758-1828) and J. C. Spurzheim (1776-1832), sought to meet this desire with the doctrines of phrenology, which taught that an expert could read a subject's cranial development and so measure his emotional drives. It was always a crude idea, and in the United States especially it fell among popularizers and charlatans. Nevertheless, many cultural leaders in Australia found phrenology an attractive study.⁴⁰ The *Colonial Literary Journal* and the *New South Wales Magazine* published pertinent articles; institutes sponsored many lectures; even the Australian Library received the *Phrenological Journal* from Britain.

At first glance, the phrenologists' attitude might appear irrational. If man's characteristics were so obvious that they appeared in the very structure of his bones, was not the natural result pessimism, based on the apprehension that men were fixed in their ways beyond all control? No phrenologist took this view. The common argument was that once a man's characteristics were understood, then he could be trained into righteousness. Thus phrenology coalesced with the prevailing emphasis on education. Henry Melville, journalist-philosopher of Tasmania, appreciated the problem of determinism, but reached a typical conclusion:

the form of the skull is either stamped at the birth by nature, following her own laws, dependent on the generative organs of parents trans-

mitting their peculiarities; or by education . . . I have no doubt but that, if children's heads were carefully examined, and their organs studied, their propensities might be very materially guided as the teacher pleased. Bring up a child in the way he should go, and he will not depart from the path of rectitude.⁴¹

One James Hamilton, a fervent advocate of the study as 'not only a true but a practical Science', established a school guided by its principles. A manual designed for bush mothers who had to teach their own children—*Letters on Education* by Hannah Villiers Boyd—carried adulation of phrenological principles very far, even to grotesqueness. Yet Mrs Boyd used phrenology to drive home the point that every personality required individual treatment. An attitude which first appeared crudely naïve in fact encouraged subtlety and discrimination.

Other branches of social science were linked with phrenology, those interested in the treatment of criminals and lunatics especially looking for its aid. As early as 1836 a Scottish baronet suggested to the British government that all convicts sentenced to transportation should undergo phrenological examination, so that men best suited to colonial pioneering might be sent to Australia.⁴² The greatest of all penologists to work in the colonies, Alexander Maconochie, was a student of the creed. By teaching that man's untrained faculties inspired his actions, phrenology presented a powerful weapon to those who denied that vengeance should be an aim of punishment. Lowe's 'psychological compulsion' defence of the murderer Knatchbull, which so annoyed the *Herald*, was featured in the *Zoist*, a phrenological journal published from London. In lunacy reform the great man in New South Wales was Dr Francis Campbell, who was a devout phrenologist. Concepts drawn from the study appear throughout his case-book, which a latter-day psychiatrist has described as 'a clinical masterpiece'.⁴³

Mesmerism took its name from the Austrian, F. A. Mesmer (1733-1815). A failure and laughing-stock in his lifetime, Mesmer developed techniques similar to those which Sigmund Freud was to use during his seminal years in Paris. In the colonies mesmerism first attracted attention as an auxiliary to the practice of medicine. A Dr Smith of Melbourne conducted several operations with its aid during 1844, evidently with success. As a forerunner of ether it had some of that prestige which attached to medical science. Even after the introduction of anaesthetics, the admirers of hypnosis claimed that it was more efficient. Furthermore they said that through mesmerism a doctor could exercise his powers of animal magnetism on the patient, with near-miraculous results. Another branch of the subject, clairvoyance, was said to facilitate diagnosis. Examples appeared to verge on fantasy. The *Australian Medical Journal* deprecated both mesmerism and phrenology.

The two studies had more in common than this opposition. It was found that a hypnotized subject would display the phrenologically

appropriate emotions when various parts of his cranium were excited. How many people thus responded, and whether any were themselves ignorant of phrenology is unknown—few and none might well be the correct answers. Nevertheless the faithful believed that this ‘phreno-mesmerism’ proved the truth of phrenology and helped its reformatory application. One of the first in Australia so to argue was Henry Melville, and in a most intriguing passage: the final paragraph of a pamphlet (1844) which revealed, but did not describe, the author’s discovery of a ‘lost creed’, based on the ancient rites of freemasonry and co-related with an abstruse system of astrology. Whether Melville’s doctrines themselves embodied phreno-mesmerism remains a mystery, unsolved by his final exposition, *Veritas*.

Not until 1849-50 did mesmerism enjoy a popular vogue, but within a narrow range it was then intense. Geelong witnessed some demonstrations in October 1849, while in the next year a Melbourne man named William Edwards wrote a pamphlet which expounded all its virtues, especially in connexion with phrenology. He argued that all children should be read and their particular weaknesses discovered, and that these be cured by training under hypnosis. Edwards stressed that any moral—but not immoral—lesson taught a mesmerized subject would remain. Thus ‘our children born in a world of temptation, with organisations tending or prone to gratify the propensities of their nature, can be changed by Mesmerism, into moral and happy members of society’. Believing this, Edwards affirmed that mesmerism ranked as ‘the greatest boon on earth’ and called for its support.

The response, at least from his fellow townsmen, was appropriate. The *Argus* forecast that the pamphlet would enjoy a popularity unprecedented in Melbourne’s history. At least two other treatises came forth;⁴⁴ the city’s premier periodical, the *Illustrated Australian Magazine*, frequently discussed the subject; W. B. Wilmot, the City coroner and a devout educationist, welcomed this proof that the mind had a system of intra-communication, which could be investigated and controlled. Meanwhile public demonstrations of phreno-mesmerism aroused tremendous interest. Up to seven hundred people came to watch G. A. Gilbert (one-time secretary of the Melbourne Mechanics’ Institute) perform on his subject, an aboriginal. They heard all the virtues of mesmerism expounded, especially its promise to introduce a new stage in human development ‘by exhibiting man as at once delivered from the thralldom of his exterior senses, and enabled to attain to greater heights of moral excellence’.⁴⁵ Another advocate was Dr James Motherwell, destined to be leader of Melbourne’s spiritualists when this study contributed much to the golden age of Melbourne’s cultural life. Mesmerism attracted no great interest in Sydney. In Hobart the latter months of 1850 saw a reflection of the hubbub in Melbourne, the chief figure being one William Poyser.

Edwards had said that mesmerism was 'the greatest boon on earth'; when merging into spiritualism it invaded heaven also. Melville's interest in astrology further reflected this aspect of the new faith, while in Sydney Mr Moreau, an 'Ultra Phrenologist' and dabbler in astrology, set up as a consultant on future events 'more particularly on all questions which involve loss or gain'.⁴⁶ So charlatanry and the absurd obtruded: yet some deeper significance remained. Moral enlightenment embraced every facet of life and all eternity. Moreau and Melville were creations of the *Zeitgeist*.

THE FAITH, THE WILL, AND THE SOUL

Appeal to the Will: Temperance

FROM 1808 societies devoted to restricting the use of spirituous liquors appeared in the northern United States, beginning the Temperance movement in its modern sense. At first progress was slight. Not for a decade did the campaign cross the Atlantic and reach Ireland; it took almost as long to move over the Irish Sea. But this last advance was part of a dramatic upsurge, which continued for some ten to fifteen years throughout the English-speaking world. In England the movement became a characteristic element in the life of millions in the new industrial towns; in Ireland it interlocked with Repeal; in the United States it ranked second only to the crusade for the abolition of slavery in the ferment of moral reformism which was the most exciting and powerful force in national affairs before the Civil War. Alexis de Tocqueville, perspicacious as ever, saw that the association of men for such a purpose was a remarkable and pregnant element in modern democracy. His argument had wider validity than for America alone: the phases and spirit of the movement varied little from place to place.

The message came to Australia with the Quaker missionaries Backhouse and Walker. They founded a society at Hobart in 1832; almost simultaneously Charles Price and another Independent minister, W. P. Crook, organized groups at Launceston and Sydney respectively. These sparks did not catch fire for a few years, but then the flames rose quickly. From being so many more conventions of 'do-gooders', lay and clerical, the societies assumed a distinct and even formidable character. One milestone was the appearance (Sydney, mid-1837) of the *Australian Temperance Magazine*, first of several journals devoted to this cause. Its literary quality was high, and its circulation (4,000 was the nominal peak) far above that of any contemporary. The next three or four years were the heyday of 'moderate' Temperance: appropriately this was the subject of the first public lecture delivered in Melbourne.

Meanwhile, the call for total abstinence had rung out. Early in 1838 the Temperance societies in both capitals were exhorted to abandon moderation; in September 1838 a teetotal society was formed in Sydney, and an attempt was made to establish the principle at Launceston. The difference between the abstainers and the moderates centred on attitudes to non-spirituous alcoholic drinks. A typical Temperance pledge ran:

We agree to abstain from distilled spirits, except for medicinal purposes, and to discountenance the causes and practice of Intemperance.

The Tasmanian abstainers, however, pledged:

We, the undersigned, do agree that we will not use intoxicating liquors as a beverage, nor traffic in them; that we will not provide them as an article of entertainment, or for persons in our employment; and that, in all suitable ways, we will discountenance their use throughout the community.

Abstainers regarded moderates as hypocritical or dishonest. 'Cheating of conscience' was one phrase used during the controversy at Hobart, and in Melbourne hostility became still more palpable. Suspicion that moderates wanted to deprive the labourer of his grog, but not the rich man of his wine, permeated many discussions.

The result of the clash was a near-absolute victory for teetotalism. In Sydney this was most apparent in the conversion of John Saunders, since 1835 the guiding light of Temperance there. Under his editing the *Temperance Advocate*, a weekly newspaper which had succeeded the *Australian Temperance Magazine* in mid-1840, became increasingly defensive *vis-à-vis* abstinence; it even adopted the argument—not inherently absurd, but unlikely to win much respect—that the aims of Temperance and teetotalism were identical, but that the former offered more effective means. By the annual meeting of the New South Wales Temperance Society in 1842 this apologetic tone was yet stronger: few speakers claimed more for moderation than that it prepared for abstinence. Already (January 1842) the *Advocate* had become the *Teetotaller and General Newspaper*. Elsewhere moderate societies folded completely; total abstinence, the rebellious but legitimate child of moderate Temperance, ruled the household.

Strengthened by its triumph over moderation, teetotalism flourished in the early forties. The societies founded at Launceston (the Tasmanian Teetotal Society, 1841), Melbourne (1842), Hobart (1843), most provincial towns, and even villages, grew fast. Meetings occurred as often as once a week. By 1845, three thousand people had signed the abstinence pledge in Sydney. During 1843 the *Teetotal Advocate* appeared in Launceston, while the *Total Abstainer and Temperance Advocate* briefly took over from the defunct *Teetotaller* in Sydney. The *Sun* (1843) also ostensibly supported the cause, although its main function was to urge the election to the Legislative Council of Robert Cooper, Sydney's chief distiller! Hobart entered the field with a magazine, the *Van Diemen's Land Temperance Herald* (1845-9?) and John Moore essayed a teetotal newspaper before he began the *Hobart Guardian*. The development of licensed victuallers' associations in both colonies was probably a reflex of the movement. John Morgan was a propagandist for the Hobart publicans, and in their interest conducted the *Morning Advertiser* (1841).

The first flush of enthusiasm died in 1846-7. The Temperance press fell away, meetings no longer attracted notice in the general newspapers, and the whole movement faltered. Partly as a symptom, partly as a result of this decline, squabbling erupted in the leading societies of both capitals. In Sydney these disputes confirmed depression; in Hobart the friction generated new energy. Two notable results were creation of the Tasmanian Total Abstinence Agency Association, which raised funds to send an itinerant advocate into country districts, and the appearance (1850) of the *Temperance Banner*, later the *Standard of Tasmania*, edited by William Poyser, the mesmerist. At a conference held in October 1851 the two major groups in Hobart claimed over 5,000 active members and 11,000 signatures (no doubt overlapping); that at Launceston 1,000 members and 4,000 signatures; the Roman Catholic Society, 5,600 signatures.¹

The secular societies emulated John Lynch's enthusiasm for building halls devoted to the cause. Hobart and Melbourne had appropriately impressive structures, and even a small town like Longford, Tasmania, added to the number. Benefit associations, libraries, a debating club, youth organizations (at Hobart including a school), ran in conjunction with different societies. Vast speech-making characterized meetings, while a torrent of tea swept the whole movement along. At one Melbourne party some ladies tallied sixteen cups apiece, and Father Lynch gave his society at Maitland a tea-service of four hundred settings. New-fangled coffee-houses offered conviviality to the faithful, facilities for pledge-signing to novitiates; from the early forties Temperance hotels also flourished.

Eminent and able citizens supported the movement. John Saunders recorded his first impression of the Australians as 'people so thin, so sun-burnt & many of them so drunk';² he at once set out to change the last trait. Secretary of the Temperance Society for years, its quasi-missionary in rural districts, editor of the *Australian Temperance Magazine* and *Temperance Advocate*, link between moderation and abstinence—these were among his functions. Many notabilities spoke at a public meeting which farewelled him from New South Wales in late 1847; the Baptist creed received no mention, Temperance very much. A fulsome appreciation of Saunders as 'The Temperance Advocate' also appeared in *Heads of the People*, while Harpur addressed to him a paean of praise. Saunders's counterpart in Tasmania was G. W. Walker, for whom Temperance probably bulked largest in his work for social regeneration. He and Bonwick organized first the abstinence group at Hobart in 1843 and three years later a specifically Christian society. The Reverend M. T. Adam, originally imported by Lang as chaplain to the Seamen's Bethel, was dominant among Sydney teetotallers in their halcyon years. Born and educated in Scotland, later a representative of the London Missionary Society in India, Adam had been in the United States immediately before coming to Australia, and brought with him the confidence and

determination which characterized the movement there. His farewell—in November 1845—prompted a meeting even more enthusiastic than that later accorded Saunders, although it did not have the same social tone.

A measure of the difference between Governors Bourke and Gipps, both liberals, was that while the one sided with Roman Catholics and doctrinaire Whig-radicals, the other supported Temperance. The first New South Wales public meeting ever to have a Governor as its chairman was the annual meeting of the Sydney Society in June 1838. Gipps became its president and an influential friend. He never signed an abstinence pledge, but his speech at the 1842 annual meeting of the Temperance Society perfectly expressed that apologetic strain which had become so pervasive. Franklin, La Trobe, Eardley-Wilmot, and Denison were all sympathetic to the movement. The New South Wales bench provided several supporters—Forbes (first president of the Temperance Society in Sydney), Dowling, Burton, Therry, à Beckett, and especially Stephen, an outspoken abstainer. Boasting of its circulation, the *Teetotaler* named most of these luminaries as well as Deas Thomson and Sir Maurice O'Connell, commander of the local regiment.

* * *

The conviction most obviously underlying the Temperance philosophy was that alcohol caused much of the world's unhappiness. Reporting on the colony's morality, Gipps pursued the Temperance line: 'Drunkenness, the fruitful parent of every species of Crime, is still the prevailing vice of the Colony.'³ J. H. Plunkett, another lawyer-sympathizer, likewise slated intemperance as the major source of crime; the *Advocate* put the figure at nineteen-twentieths, the residue being attributed to 'man's natural depravity'.⁴ In the same *simplicite* spirit, Temperance men attributed the depression of the forties to general extravagance, especially the export of capital to pay for liquor from abroad. More shyly, they also traced sexual lusts to the demon alcohol.

Not liquor as such, but the whole regeneration of society was the crux of the movement. Temperance offered disciples of the new faith yet another opportunity to proclaim their message. Utopia could be reached not only through educating the mind and the psyche, but also through the effort of will signified by pledge-signing. Many were the links between culture and Temperance. Saunders once described his followers as constituting 'in effect, an education society'; the Temperance group at Patrick's Plains grew out of a debating club; in the most 'cultured' production of the Sydney press before 1850—J. S. Prout's *Sydney Illustrated*, with letterpress by John Rae—a reference suddenly appeared to 'the property of Mr Nobbs . . . one of a very prolific class of public nuisances, where distilled poison is daily dispensed to Her Majesty's lieges in the Australian metropolis'.⁵ The devotion of Bonwick to Temperance was pertinent; still more so that of Harpur, whose

description of the movement included the phrase which best described the new faith:

being founded in the heart of wisdom; being a child of the world's better destiny; being of the essence of that spirit of moral enlightenment which is beginning to burst like sunrise over the long benighted earth; being in fine, not so much a graft upon the tree of modern advancement in social propriety as a shoot from its very pith.⁶

In verse, too, he celebrated its effect.

This deeper significance of Temperance explained the advancing of many apparently bombastic claims on its behalf. Thus indulgence in liquor was characteristically described as 'the bane of social order and national improvement'⁷—not 'a bane of' or 'an impediment to' these ends. At Launceston a Temperance lecturer posited his subject as the supreme issue in human regeneration: 'there are two ruling principles operating in the world, those of good and evil, and by our daily words and actions we are aiding the one or the other'.⁸ The equation of Temperance with morality-at-large distinguished an attempt to found a society at Maitland in 1841. Some potential members declared themselves opposed to signing a pledge, although supporting its purposes. One suggested that the organization call itself 'the Society for the Moral Improvement of Maitland'. The *Advocate* denigrated the plan: the pledge had proved incomparably effective.

Like culture, Temperance sought to comprehend every member of society. The teetotallers protested against moderation that it excluded the wine-bibbing respectability, and even before he accepted abstinence Saunders published articles in the *Magazine* which called upon 'The Magistracy' and 'The Gentry' to discard all reservation in support of Temperance. Primarily, however, the message called to the workingman, or—to use Saunders's term—'The Commonalty': 'the fangs of Intemperance are clotted with the blood of the poor . . . to the needy Intemperance is the King of terrors, to them he is worse than death'.⁹ Such declarations often sounded patronizing, but, like the advocacy of baths and wash-houses, they arose from determination to spread the gospel to Everyman.

The movement sought the patronage of women. Lady Gipps followed her husband's lead; she was perhaps influenced also by Lady Franklin, whom Saunders urged to intercede with her counterpart in Sydney 'as female sanction much wanted'.¹⁰ One of the fiercest advocates in southern Australia was Mrs Dalgarno, a sea captain's wife who travelled with her husband from port to port. She sought the formation of separate women's societies, which duly came about. This trend paralleled concern for better education of girls, just as emphasis on juvenile societies paralleled faith in primary education. 'Let us secure the vantage ground', said Poyser, '—take possession not only of the youth of this colony, but also of the world, and indoctrinate their minds with the debasement

of the rational soul, with the immense depravity which follows drunkenness.¹¹

Leaders of the movement always urged administrative action against the liquor trade, seeing therein further promise of man achieving the Millennium by resolute, straightforward action. As early as 1835 a cry rose against governments regarding liquor primarily as a source of revenue¹²—an idealistic protest indeed, since the trade contributed an extremely high proportion of official income. The *Colonist* newspaper approved full prohibition of the spirit traffic in April 1836, and the subject became prominent at society meetings. Saunders said that it was 'the acknowledged duty of government to exercise its power for the welfare of the people, and yet it will be found that in the spirit question it has exerted an influence altogether of a prejudicial kind'.¹³ He argued that the government should encourage the manufacture of cheap wine and should provide facilities for wholesome sports and amusements. Everywhere Temperance men scrutinized the licensing courts, anxious to limit retail trade. The Melbourne societies appointed a standing counsel. A more positively political note sounded when a candidate for the first municipal election addressed Sydney teetotallers *en masse*, while Tasmanian spokesmen frankly argued for the return of sympathizers to the legislature. Appropriately, some Sydney groups petitioned against the Party Processions Prevention Bill: by 1846 the movement did constitute a 'party'.

Although engaging in short-term politics, Temperance men believed that their doctrine promised relief from all factionalism, both political and religious. The claim underlay much of the philosophy already outlined, but there were many instances of its direct adumbration. One was in the *Sydney Sun*:

under the banner of Total Abstinence is protection from the deadliest assaults of the enemy of mankind, and from the sound and fury of controversial warfare both in politics and religion. Here all national, religious and political prejudices vanish and are absorbed in the one overpowering sentiment of charity and good will to all (29 April 1843).

Even more eloquent was the *Teetotal Advocate's* description of 'The Character of Teetotalism':

it is a principle for the *rich*, and yet it is not *aristocratic*; it is a principle for the *poor*, and yet no *democratic* exclusiveness can be detected in it. It is a principle for the *people*, and yet it is unmixed with politics; it is a *patriot* principle, ready to hold warm and affectionate intercourse with *every party* in the state, and yet from the views of each and every party, studiously keeping itself aloof. All can adopt it (26 June 1843).

Such passages deepened the parallel between Temperance and culture.

Both sought to infuse all mankind with fraternal benevolence and common ideals. Temperance men, like culturists, believed that their specific had greater potency than police or soldiery; that it would eliminate unjust and rigid class distinctions; that from its inspiration nationhood could and must derive. An early declaration of the New South Wales Temperance Society condemned drunkenness for 'loosening all the ties which bind man to man'; as if in response a correspondent of the *Magazine* later exhorted his fellows to 'rest at nothing short of this consummation—one so benevolent, so honorable, so desirable, and so glorious—the absolute sovereignty of temperance'.¹⁴ The *Advocate* claimed 'the right to dictate, if we dictate well'.¹⁵ Temperance was an aggressive creed, seeking absolute triumph.

* * *

The movement was remarkable for adding much colour to the lives of its devotees, evoking a heartfelt passion not easily achieved in the humdrum life of any small colony. An early dramatic moment came in 1836 when the quasi-Quaker merchant John Tawell dumped a load of spirits, consigned to him in his pre-Temperance days, into Sydney harbour. Spectators gaped in wonder, one calling, 'that's real murder'. (Ironically, Tawell died on the gallows for poisoning his mistress.) Saunders and George Allen showed the depth of their feelings by forswearing tobacco, which many spokesmen condemned second only to alcohol. The cause affected many areas of life. The Australian Methodists were very active teetotallers, and broke away from the parent body partly through their repugnance to take wine, even in the Sacrament. The appearance of a pamphlet on Hydropathy (Launceston 1846) and the arrival of Dr John Singleton (Melbourne 1851) were two forecasts of the impact of Temperance upon medical practice.

The rise of teetotalism pertained to this enthusiasm. Moderation, not merely in drinking but in every attitude, conflicted with the abstainers' ethos. The proceedings of the teetotal societies often demonstrated how thoroughly the movement absorbed its disciples. At one stage the Sydney group considered adopting a full dress uniform. The plan fell through, but the faithful could at least wear Temperance medals. Many teetotal meetings were enlivened by personal testimonials, some from lifelong sobersides, some from ex-drunkards, some from the associates of ex-drunkards. 'Well I and mother know it', said one boy of his father's new-found virtue, 'for everything goes on well now, and I am sent to school which I never was before'.¹⁶ Propaganda stressed the physical effects of alcohol (it could lead to internal combustion of the body) or the strength vouchsafed by abstinence (one teetotaler had undergone an operation for the removal of a growth from his testicles, disregarded medical advice to take spirits to deaden the pain, and recovered within days).¹⁷

The display which characterized the Roman Catholic teetotal societies

was typical of the movement generally. Whatever their theology, abstainers throughout the world loved brass music: those at Launceston formed probably the pioneer civil band in Australia, while the Melbourne Society sponsored the first performance on the saxhorn in that progressive city. Temperance song-books were on sale in Hobart in 1846, and at least some of the abstainers there danced upon the green. Such activities joined coffee-houses and tea-consumption in promoting cheerful community. 'Festivals' were frequent and highly convivial affairs, distinguished by processions, exhortations, tea, and cake. Perhaps the most famous was that given by George Allen during his mayoralty, a thousand guests sitting at table. They probably sang such songs as this:

Let the Sun be thy nectar!
 Drink deep of its beams:
 Let the green sward of nature
 Thy banquet hall be!
 Fill thy spirit with sunlight,—
 'Tis richer than streams
 Of the wine-flowing goblet,
 And better for thee!—

Let the Sun be thy nectar;
 'Tis next to divine!
 Where's a vintage more golden
 To gladden thine eyes?
 What's the charm of the goblet,
 The grace of the vine,
 Compared to a banquet
 Thus brought from the skies?—

Oh! air of the mountain!
 Best wine of the world!—
 Enrich'd with the sweetness
 Of nature alone,—
 I drink of thy spirit
 With sun-gems impearl'd;
 And challenge Man's vintage
 To equal thine own!¹⁸

Especially in Hobart spokesmen were prepared to theorize in justifying this encouragement of the emotions. In doing so they broke openly from the emphasis on decorous behaviour, which was no less a factor in moral enlightenment. Thus, the editor of Moore's teetotal newspaper quoted Channing to counter prudish, spoilsport criticism of the abstainers' singing and dancing. William Poyser spoke out in the same Transcendentalist vein:

give to the young disciples of temperance the elements of thought, self-reliance, a capacity to investigate, an inherent love of truth, to embody self-evident truths in gorgeous drapery of fancy, and the refined and sublimated associations of imagination, in pastoral beauty, scenic embellishment, up to the most extended combinations of spiritual enthusiasm. Create a taste pure and classical, until the soul is exalted and lives on truth, moral and inspired.¹⁹

Poyser again waxed lyrical in approving the formation of a cricket club at one of Hobart's Temperance hotels. This echoed Saunders's advocacy of government-sponsored amusements, while Gipps too linked his Temperance principles with a desire to see the common people engaging in 'the athletic sports, which are national to us'.

Many upholders of Temperance felt wary of the movement's extremists. Saunders himself rebuked the 'personality and tirade' which marred the abstainers' work, in contrast to the 'moderate and rational' quality of the older movement.²⁰ Such criticism found clearest expression in the *Herald*, for Mansfield, Kemp, and Fairfax all supported moderate Temperance yet treated Adam and his abstainers in much the same fashion as Lang and his democrats. Nor did singing and dancing win universal praise: many teetotallers adhered to the Puritan rather than to the Transcendentalist position.

This division was part of a wider cleavage within the new faith. Duncan described a common fear 'that the temperance movement is not progressing from the effects of reason and enlightenment, but from those of enthusiasm, which is to be despised, or perhaps dreaded'.²¹ Duncan himself did not agree, but the *Examiner*, for instance, did. One correspondent argued that abstinence attracted some persons through the opportunity it gave fanaticism; in the short run this pleasure might be potent enough to replace craving for alcohol, but it would exaggerate rather than correct an ex-drunkard's imbalance of mind. Others attacked Temperance philosophy by insisting that 'no people can be moral who are uneducated';²² they abhorred the new doctrine's implied belittling of intellectual training. Lillie's first address as President of the Hobart Mechanics' Institute claimed that 'institutions similar to that which he addressed, were the most effective sort of Temperance Societies'.²³ Two distinct if not mutually exclusive groups faced one another in Launceston in the early forties; one favoured the Institute, one favoured Temperance. In New South Wales, Duncan's comment notwithstanding, the conflict never became so explicit. Wentworth declared the movement 'humbug', but only the silence of Bourke, Lowe, and the *Atlas* school indicated that they more or less agreed.

The movement's belief in legislative action led to further rebuke from upholders of pure liberalism. A correspondent of the *Australian Temperance Magazine* said of the extremists that 'they appear to insist on a radical reform in the commercial world, which were their

principles fully carried out, must destroy all the existing arrangements of society'.²⁴ Richard Windeyer criticized the prohibitionist trend at the 1839 annual meeting of the Sydney Temperance Society. The Sydney *Monitor* maintained that the appetite for strong liquor was as far beyond the power of legislation to control as was the appetite for sex.²⁵ The *Herald* had no doubt that the principles of Adam Smith were right in this matter, and the prohibitionists wrong.

This division of opinion did not invalidate the place of Temperance within the new faith. The prohibitionists' argument was akin to the belief that the state must provide education. More important, the controversy merely continued the dispute between those who spurned and those who upheld the role of drama and imaginative literature. Poyser's appeal to the affections was the counterpart of Harpur's exposition of the nature of poetry. The enthusiastic strain in Temperance stressed that moral enlightenment was a life-affirming force which appealed to every faculty of man.

What of the Soul? Moral Enlightenment and Christianity

As well as being a student of phreno-mesmerism and astrology, Henry Melville was a critic of Christianity. 'The Christian creed', said his pamphlet of 1844, 'wash it of its dross and tinsel, and it is but the creed of the Egyptian triad and the Buddhist unity.' He repudiated the Bible story of the creation, especially its disregard of geology, with a touch sure enough to justify his later claim to have anticipated the modernism of J. W. Colenso. The moral doctrine of Christianity was satisfactory enough, but few sincerely practised it; more than any other major religion this bore the scars of sectarianism. Among the many contradictions which Melville saw in Christianity was belief in God's omnipotence side-by-side with His alleged incapacity to remedy 'man's evil propensities'. No less objectionable was the notion that one repentant sinner had greater glory in heaven than the lifelong exponent of good works. Although Melville scorned his contemporaries' confidence in the wisdom of their age, he had no doubt that Christianity was about to give way to a higher dispensation. 'The march of intellect . . . as it advances, will induce men to read and judge for themselves, and the whole vision of our fabled superstition must, before long, be exploded.'²⁶

This pamphlet, which Melville withdrew after publication, was unique in its explicit attack on Christianity. Most upholders of the new faith would have angrily denied any charge of unbelief. Two particular episodes illustrated this attitude. The first concerned Lowe's 'psychological compulsion' defence of the murderer Knatchbull. The *Zoist's* publication of Lowe's address naturally aroused interest in Sydney. The *Atlas* quoted the English magazine at length; the *Herald* then criticized Lowe's argument as contrary to the Christian doctrine of free will.

The barrister's response was to accuse the editors of Pelagian over-emphasis on the choice open to man; ostensibly he spurned any touchstone but formal Christianity. The second episode related to the appointment of a headmaster to Hobart High, a task delegated to two colonists resident in London, J. A. Jackson and Charles McLachlan, acting in conjunction with the Senate of University College. Their choice fell upon J. A. Froude. Simultaneously, publication of his agnostic essay, *The Nemesis of Faith*, led to Froude's disgrace at Oxford and severance from Anglican Orders. The Tasmanian selectors at once cancelled his appointment. Froude did lack the prerequisite that candidates hold 'no extreme religious opinions', but, as the Englishman's biographer was to write, the panel acted 'pusillanimously'. The School council supported the decision, denying Gell's charge that the original choice showed the institution's 'infidel' tendency.²⁷ But the qualification demanded of candidates was revealing, and Eccleston probably cared less than Froude about faith. Writing home, Thomas Arnold described the second choice as 'a canny, talkative Irishman, with nothing spiritual about him'.²⁸ Lowe used the Pelagian argument to score points rather than to express his own beliefs. So these episodes suggested that despite the superficial loyalty of the new faith to the old, the two were finally at odds. Melville was peculiar only in being forthright; the trend of his argument was typical.

This is not to imply that all advocates of moral enlightenment were hypocrites. The situation was far too confused to allow so simple a judgment. These men did not work out a new system of thought, nor a new vocabulary. What they did, subconsciously and informally, was to identify their belief with so-called 'true religion'. That is, they declared that genuine Christianity taught moral enlightenment, and nothing else. Whether this was a true reading of Christianity remains open. Had Christ come again in 1850 He might have joined the moral-liberal camp, but if so He would have found Himself opposed by those most attached to Christianity in its traditional, theological sense. Hints of this conflict obtruded at point after point in the interplay of Christianity and moral enlightenment.

The Church of England led the Christian attack on the new faith and in turn drew most of its fire. In part liberal animosity to the Church sprang from hatred of privilege. In England actually, in the colonies potentially, Anglicanism had a peculiar and therefore abominable status. Hence developed, before the Church Acts, liberal sympathy for the voluntary principle. E. S. Hall (in his *Monitor*) and R. L. Murray (in his *Review*) pushed this argument hard; Murray said any connexion between church and state was 'adulterous', 'incestuous'.²⁹ The Church of England rather than the concept of state aid being their target, such men did not object to multi-establishment. Overall, indeed, the Church Acts appealed more to men of the new faith than of the old. But, as Broughton knew too well, the liberals did in a sense treat Anglicans

differently from other Christians—as more open to criticism and government control.

This animosity soon took the distinctive colour of moral enlightenment. The Church's insistence on its status and its distinctive beliefs seemed to demonstrate irresponsibility, if not delinquency, especially by fostering like assertion in other groups. The great bane of Anglicanism, declared one commentator in 1839, was its want of 'a mild, a tolerant, and a conciliating spirit'.³⁰ The *Monitor* even suggested that the government should replace Broughton with a more amenable man. Tractarianism, which emphasized these undesirable traits, naturally provoked the liberals' wrath. Especially during Lowe's editorship, the *Atlas* maintained this offensive with extreme acerbity. It jeered at the attraction of Puseyism for women; at the 'mediaeval nonsense' which stressed the significance of ritual and architecture; at the tendency of the new doctrine to create division within the Church.³¹ The *Australian* once bemoaned the last factor simply because it lessened the effectiveness of the Church as a teacher of morality.

The charge of the new faith was heaviest against Anglo-Catholicism's reservations towards human liberty and rationality. The *Atlas* denigrated opposition to non-denominational education as part of 'a deep and settled plan' to keep the people in passive ignorance. The journal appealed to 'the enlightened members of each congregation' to throw off this yoke; the lay association and the choral society, subservient to the clergy and proud of it, seemed terrible indeed. That ministers encouraged these attitudes bespoke their 'ridiculous and insane' desire to subdue the masses, deny private judgment, and halt enlightenment—all 'for the sake of a priestly power and influence'.³²

Attacks on the formal government of the Church combined these themes. To the *Colonial Times* Broughton's appointment from England seemed to interfere in the progress of colonial self-government; Murray's *Review* treated the move as a gross joke, frequently gibing at 'My Lord Will', or 'the Ecclesiastical Baron, the Lord "Will B. Australia"', who for all his pomp had less 'practical usefulness' than many a humble Dissenter.³³ Imposition of Church discipline provoked much criticism. 'We warn all proud Prelates', said the *Atlas*, 'that unless they think a little less of their own worldly honors, and a little more of the Spiritual welfare of their flocks, their Lordships will soon be "left alone in their glory"'.³⁴ This journal alleged that Broughton opposed squatting because he would find a scattered Church more difficult to control. The Freehold Benefice Bill attempted to weaken episcopal power; Lowe hoped it would secularize the clergy, unite them with their congregations, and encourage a noble 'spirit of independence'.³⁵ He maintained that Broughton violated the constitution in creating a Consistorial Court.

Many liberals sympathized with the Roman Catholic Church. Not only Bourke, but Wentworth, Jamison, Bland—the core of the 'Patriot' group—all supported the Church's claim to status and respect. Among

the younger liberals, Richard Windeyer spoke of Polding as having 'the greatest share of dignity . . . the greatest respect and influence in the colony', while Lowe addressed a poem to Caroline Chisholm as 'the guardian angel of her helpless sex'.³⁶ Various liberal newspapers followed this pattern. Until alienated by Ullathorne's criticisms of transportation, the *Australian* supported the Roman Catholic interest, making unnecessary any Church journal; Hall was sympathetic both when he edited the *Monitor* and later when he accused colonial Tories of seeking to arouse enmity against Romanism as previously they had against emancipists. The alliance appeared also in the *Port Phillip Herald*, the *Colonial Times*, and *Murray's Review*. The last was particularly significant, for Murray was Tasmania's leading freemason. That he, G. R. Nichols (his mainland counterpart in this respect), and Henry Macdermott could align themselves with both Romanism and masonry was a remarkable sign of the times.

The liberals' attachment was in part a factor of their hostility to Anglicans, but it also reciprocated current Roman support for liberal principles. Some men even hoped that Romanism was experiencing a sea change, in favour of moral enlightenment. Gipps perfectly expressed the new faith when he sought to rebuke Broughton by declaring that 'Rome was becoming more tolerant than Lambeth'.³⁷ Non-Roman comment on novel elements in the Church's philosophy meant to applaud as often as to jeer: Morgan (an admirer of Channing) spoke for the new faith as well as Orangeism when he appealed to the laity to pursue their religion free from a dominant priesthood.

The other side of this coin was that sympathy for Roman Catholicism often sprang from misunderstanding of its nature. When liberals faced reality, most showed the same hostility to Rome as to Lambeth. Harpur's 'Finality' expressed this disillusion: the Church might appear to have accepted enlightenment, but basically the priesthood sought power and wealth in a greedy, earthling spirit. Hall castigated Church infallibility as a 'slavish' doctrine and had no more sympathy than Morgan for the priesthood. Not all masons felt like Murray and Nichols; influence from this quarter precipitated a quarrel within the Melbourne Benevolent Society. Again, one *Atlas* editorial argued that so long as Romanists applied themselves to religion alone, 'we shall do no more than smile at their nonsensical mummeries, or pity their senseless superstition'; but should they engage in politics, remorseless attack would ensue.³⁸ This journal was chosen by one who had noticed and wished to publicize the equivocation of Mrs Chisholm's supporters.³⁹

Protestantism was one of the influences from which moral enlightenment developed, and the sympathy which so many Protestants had for Temperance, general education, and voluntarism further bound this variant of the old faith with the new. Yet just as ultra-Protestants criticized 'false liberality', so their extremism was objectionable to disciples of moral enlightenment. The most obvious form of this antipathy

was deprecation of Orangeism. To Lowe the movement was a 'hideous monster'; he and other liberals voted for the Processions Prevention Act, its infringement on personal liberty notwithstanding, because it checked Orange ravages. But the conflict between Protestantism and the new faith touched deeper levels. R. L. Murray denied the common assumption that post-Reformation Christianity had inspired freedom and enlightenment; the link was but negative, comprising 'counter-forces' which were 'indirect and independent of her will'.⁴⁰ Harpur declared that Protestantism approached his ideal closer than did other Christian belief, but warned:

still mere Protestantism is *not* the Religious Finality—and least of all Church and state protestantism. Religion in the future will have to found itself upon the nearest approach which can be made by it, in its collective operancy, to an individual basis—namely, a congregational one: or continuing to strive against the spirit of progress, it will be eventually trodden out by it; that is, in its public capacity, to exist simply as a private tendency in the pious hearts and unfailing consciences of men—of men religiously guided by, and amenable to God alone.

One of the major themes of a theological work to which Hall devoted his latter years was criticism of all clergy, Protestant or Catholic. Years before, the *Monitor* had written apropos a scandal surrounding the Baptist John McKaeg that 'any man taking a pew in a chapel can be devout; but who can be always benevolent, always generous, always good?'⁴¹ Only on its own terms did moral enlightenment accept Protestantism; whenever the latter inclined to hierarchical organization, or to sophisticated theology—whenever, in short, it took itself seriously—friction developed.

*

*

*

A closer study of the stress on culture reaffirms the incompatibility of the new faith with the old. Again Harpur's 'Finality' made the single most revealing comment:

what can true religion have to fear from knowledge, the correlative of truth? Or if superstition be necessary to hold ignorance in order, should the people be kept illiterate for the sake of a check so meanly, so miserably reactive? But away with all paltering! Whatever cannot coexist with entire intellectual liberty, and an unlimited scope for knowledge, progressively extending itself in all directions, cannot be a true Finality.

This passage aimed at the critics of the 1844 Education Committee report, which had also invoked 'true religion' in support of the National system. The education controversy generally was crucial for showing the mutual antagonism between the faiths. Not only Henry Carmichael disparaged all clerical interference in teaching. W. B. Wilmot distin-

guished between the 'natural' and the 'spiritual' mind; he maintained that the former alone was amenable to training, and he insisted that purely secular education perform this function. Through the interference of professing Christians, Wilmot believed, 'the goodly plant of social morality which teaches us our duty towards our fellow creatures . . . is supplanted by that spurious growth of pharisaical hypocrisy, the peculiar object of God's displeasure'.⁴² Wentworth, an arch-secularist, said that he would exclude all trace of religion from the University simply to avoid dissension, but the persistent tell-tale phrase reappeared in his declaration that this institution 'by increasing education, by diffusing enlightenment, by softening and elevating the habits and manners of the people, will greatly advantage the cause of true religion'.⁴³ Hall and Eccleston also wanted to omit all theology from education. In the same spirit, mechanics' institutes and literary magazines took pride in avoiding religious topics. Yet all these voices simultaneously claimed to be offering the true basis for personal and communal happiness: they excluded religion from this most vital area of life.

The culturists often identified Christianity with simple moral virtue. 'We love God not for his omnipotence, but for his goodness',⁴⁴ declared Arthur à Beckett at the Sydney Institute, while *Heads of the People* said that seeking of truth was the philosopher's task, whereas the man of religion should devote himself to 'the principle of promoting "peace on earth, goodwill towards men"''.⁴⁵ Perhaps the magazine *Literary News* best epitomized the common feeling:

an intelligent community without churches, is better than churches without an intelligent community. The moral and intellectual faculties, should, if possible be made to keep pace with one another; but the former can only be worked upon, or appealed to, through the medium of the latter (vol. i, p. 101).

Significantly, the writer identified moral faculties with religion and believed that the mind inspired the soul. Bonwick too maintained that 'the brain is the organ by which the spiritual part of man acts'.⁴⁶ Bonwick professed Christianity, but his breadth of denominational sympathies, typical of the new faith, indicated an equal shallowness.

Critics other than Henry Melville believed that modern learning had impugned the Scriptures. Hall devoted a chapter of his *magnum opus* to this subject, annotating it as 'well argued but will be held dangerous'. Lecturing the Launceston Mechanics' Institute on 'Natural Theology' a Dr Udney declared 'we are not to shift and shuffle the solid strata of the earth to suit the dogmas of any class of men', and attacked revealed religion as the progenitor of bloodshed, ignorance, and superstition. Yet he considered the study of geology to prove the existence of some Power, and concluded that practice of the golden rule discharged 'all that religion can ever require of us'.⁴⁷ William Westgarth also believed that the Bible story needed modification to accord with geology. More

interesting, this philosopher expressed a tension between *social* science and Christian assumptions. Much of the harm suffered by the aborigines, he argued, sprang from an arrogant attempt to impose Christianity upon them.

Lowe's defence of Knatchbull was the only incident relating Christianity, or rather anti-Christianity, and phrenology. The *Herald's* theology in criticizing it was probably correct—even J. D. Lang agreed with the journal. No explicit Christian attack on the phrenologists' view of personality appeared in the local record, logical though it would have been. Speakers on the subject did sometimes deny that they were anti-Christian, so probably (as in Europe) such aspersions did circulate. That gifted observer of Australian life in the thirties, Alexander Harris, believed that far from denying Christian truth, phrenology proved it: the science had shown the central organ of the brain to be 'venerative', therefore an object of veneration must exist. Likewise the Christian virtues of faith, hope, and charity were now *demonstrably* innate human characteristics. In short, 'phrenological discovery brings to testify to the correctness of the sacred ethics a visible and undeniable fact'.⁴⁸ Harris did not say 'true religion', but the difference between this and 'sacred ethics' was minimal. His Christianity was closer to Harpur's than to Broughton's.

Mesmerism, spiritualism, and astrology also ran counter to Christianity by their very nature. Not by accident was Melville uniquely articulate in both his criticism of religion and his confidence in phreno-mesmerism. Conversely, John Saunders argued on Christian grounds against Moreau's pretensions, while an Anglican clergyman (J. D. Mereweather) who saw G. A. Gilbert practising phreno-mesmerism in Melbourne, had no doubt that he faced a hostile creed. The very title of the pamphlet, *A Catechism of Mesmerism*, hinted at blasphemy.

Temperance best revealed the new faith's divergence from traditional religion. Christian criticism of the movement was explicit and strong. Three points stood out: that Temperance sought to replace the Gospel with a secular technique, thereby both impugning the efficacy of God's word and exaggerating the power of man to help himself; that the pledge-concept denied Christian free will; and that Temperance men invested their faith with the quality of a new religion, concerned only with secular morality. The best statement of the Christian case occurred when the Anglo-Catholic newspaper *Southern Queen* explained why no Anglican clergyman attended George Allen's tea-party:

there already exists a temperance association, divinely instituted, of infinite power, and efficacy. The substitution of these confessedly human helps for that society, is a dishonor [to] the clergy (who are its sole accredited officers) . . . A resort to the attraction of a festival to lead men to the false idea, that a pledge administered for purposes of sobriety, is the sum of moral requirements, cannot be too strongly condemned (21 June 1845).

Archdeacon Marriott once criticized the movement in similar words on a more interesting occasion. Eardley-Wilmot had authorized mass purchase of the *Temperance Herald* for distribution among convicts; Gladstone questioned the move; La Trobe, temporary head of the Tasmanian administration, defended it; Archdeacon Marriott dissented; James Stephen sneered at such exclusive churchmanship; Earl Grey agreed to the purchase, provided that the magazine avoided extremism.⁴⁹ Thus the issue measured the ratio of Catholic to secular elements in the thought of representative men of the early Victorian age. A third blanket charge against the movement came from one 'Catholicus', who abhorred its 'tendency to make a man esteem the *world* BEFORE his *God*, as being in itself more powerful for his conversion, or entitled to a higher degree of homage from its worshippers'.⁵⁰

Tractarian-influenced Anglicans attacked the movement with the same clarity and vigour as they did secular education. Broughton himself at first inclined to moderate Temperance, but then moved away; doubtless his outlook caused the clergy not to attend either Allen's festival or, later, Saunders's farewell. Yet the High Churchmen were not alone. Bishop Perry told the Melbourne abstainers that men had a God-given right to the rational enjoyment of alcohol; Lang's *Colonial Observer* presented a similar argument; and the *Examiner* objected on Christian grounds to men who one day attributed their reformation to the Bible, and the next to teetotalism. Even A. M. Ramsay's journal condemned the 'blasphemous' assertion that abstinence had shown itself superior to the Scriptures in that it kept men sober more effectually.⁵¹

The support of Roman Catholicism for Temperance did not deny the movement's anti-Christian trend. Although the alliance partly represented the Church's sympathy for moral enlightenment, the formation of separate Roman Catholic societies had contrary significance. It showed that the Church was reluctant to allow its members to co-operate in the movement at large, which, by implication, could easily become alien to the faith. This judgment applied to all specifically Christian societies. In Hobart in the thirties there were two branches of the movement, one markedly more clerical; in the late forties the 'Sydney' (as distinct from the 'Australian') Society underwent a crisis for vague, sectarian reasons, the New South Wales Total Abstinence Society emerging from the upheaval. The quarrel among the Hobart abstainers in 1846 caused Bonwick and Walker to organize the (deliberately Christian) Van Diemen's Land Total Abstinence Society. The new group alleged that most of the original body were 'especially prompted . . . by their enmity or indifference to the religion of the Saviour', and that they proclaimed abstinence to be man's transcendent religious duty.⁵²

Temperance statements provided indirect yet powerful evidence of heresy. The *Sun* used the tell-tale phrase in describing the movement's power

to divest true Religion of the repulsive vestments in which ignorance and error have clothed her, and to allure back those who have been affrighted at her disguise, by presenting her in white and shining raiment with a cheerful, placid, sincere, benign countenance and pitying look, inviting the return of her truant children, and promising them protection and rest (29 April 1843).

At least one earnest teetotaler explicitly said that abstinence was essential to Christian belief;⁵³ Alexander Harris also identified the creeds, in that teetotalism became the leitmotiv of his religious life. Harpur used religious terms, both in describing his personal experience as an abstainer and in his poem to the movement.⁵⁴ Comparisons between the early days of the movement and of Christianity were frequent (both underwent persecution, appealed to the poor, and countered the prevailing conventions of the day), while such disputes as whether one Isaac Sherwin of Launceston could work for a spirit merchant without impugning his faith had all the marks of dogmatic controversy.⁵⁵

The weakness of Temperance replies to the anti-Christian charge gave final evidence of its truth. A Mr Jones from the Huon, Tasmania, illustrated how such polemics could debase Christianity:

in answer to the objection that they were putting teetotalism in the place of the gospel, he said he denied it; their object was to produce peace and love in the world, and that was the essence of the gospel.⁵⁶

No more satisfying were attempts to explain away Biblical references to wine as meaning unfermented grape juice; or to derive Scriptural authorization for abstinence from Paul's declaration that 'it is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, and is offended, or is made weak'. No colonial abstainer upheld vegetarianism, and the charge that the movement contradicted the Bible by allowing women an important place in public affairs went unanswered.

Saunders and Alfred Stackhouse, an evangelical Anglican in Tasmania, failed to clinch their more ambitious arguments for the harmony of the two faiths. Saunders stressed that Temperance applied only to the improvement of 'this terrestrial life'; the Christian should support it, along with 'the moralist, the optimist, the good-natured or the worldly wise man' as part of his concern to see Christ's ethic prevail. Further, said Saunders, the practice of Temperance had often led to revelation. He topped his argument with the assertion that 'what God honors man may cheerfully approve'.⁵⁷ The vital question was begged; the second part of the essay contradicted the first; Saunders implied that God blessed a movement in which deists and atheists participated equally with true believers. Stackhouse's logic was more rigorous. He admitted that some teetotalers *had* justified Christian criticism and he denied, for example, that Temperance really claimed equality with the Gospel, 'whatever may be the opinion of individual members'.⁵⁸ So his message

became a call for Christians to mould the movement to their faith rather than a defence of Temperance as it stood. Like the formation of Christian societies, this implied that in essence the new faith did run counter to the old.

Stackhouse demanded rhetorically why anti-Temperance Christians did not feel the same hostility to other means of securing temporal welfare—gaols, police, mutual benefit groups, wash-houses. Mr Jones pursued the same argument: ‘they had benevolent societies and building societies, all intended to do good, and they were not sneered at because they interfered with the gospel’. Neither speaker felt it necessary to examine his assumptions, yet their words had great significance. The new faith did not stop at culture, phrenology, mesmerism, and Temperance. To gauge its extent requires not only a study of the impact of these movements, but entry into a much wider range of everyday life.

THE IMPACT OF THE FAITH ON POPULAR AND PUBLIC LIFE

Extent of the Impact

THE MOST OBVIOUS point at which the new faith won recognition from government concerned primary education. Even the harshest critics of purely secular learning were happy to receive subventions for their own schools, while to most thinking colonists the provision of a comprehensive system ranked high among the state's duties. The duty was accepted; by 1851 official estimates provided for an annual expenditure of £23,000 on education in New South Wales and £5,337 in Tasmania. Nor were schools the only cultural institutions to receive state aid. The University, the major mechanics' institutes (£100-£300), botanical gardens, learned societies, the Australian Museum in Sydney (£300), the public library in Hobart (£100)—all had their grants. The sums loomed quite large against the tax-consciousness of the day.

Was there a 'popular' response—that is, in the average man's attitude to education—to equal this 'public' bounty? The number of state, church, and especially private schools (see Appendix II) was high; that of pupils, less impressive but still sizeable. From Tasmania various witnesses confirmed that these statistics represented genuine feeling. T. H. Forster, Anglican chaplain on a convict transport, believed that his Church could impress itself upon the Tasmanian lower orders only by establishing schools, for even the most depraved wanted their children to receive instruction; H. P. Fry, also writing in the late forties, declared that no community afforded more opportunities for popular education.¹ Melville agreed: 'there may be said to be a school fever just now raging among all classes of the people. With the infantile population, scholars are sought, and fought for, with great zeal'.² One of the government schoolmasters in Hobart found parents who insisted on paying more than the stipulated weekly sum.³

New South Wales experience did not prompt such forthright statements. Nevertheless, the long argument over the competing systems implied that the people did want education; one legislative committee heard that this was true of ex-convicts especially. The great test came after 1848, for the inauguration of National schools depended largely on local enthusiasm. A. G. Austin's study of G. W. Rusden, touring

agent for the National Board, has led him to conclude that the new venture revealed a 'heartening demand' and that 'the people's response in terms of schools initiated had been very satisfactory'.⁴ The archives of the National Board show that enthusiasm fluctuated widely but could touch positive excitement. From Wagga Wagga the police magistrate reported:

the anxiety so generally evinced by the laboring classes here, for the education of their children, affords . . . the most confident assurance that the establishment of a school at Wagga Wagga, will be hailed as a blessing by those for whose benefit it is principally intended, and that when in operation, it will be warmly supported by all classes and denominations throughout the District.⁵

One of the few places where denominationalists actively opposed the new system was Carcoar. Crying 'if we cannot have divinity in any particular form, let us have reading and writing in all their branches', the 'Nationals' overwhelmed their opponents.⁶ The incident must have delighted Rusden, who by 1853 claimed that the National plan had proved overwhelmingly popular. The distinctively liberal view of education was fast making headway.

In mid-1851 H. C. E. Childers prepared an illuminating report on Victorian schools.⁷ He praised the 'prevalent spirit of enquiry, the attention and goodwill of the Legislature, and the absence of the extreme social distinctions', which all helped create an atmosphere receptive to education. Childers estimated that two-thirds of all eligible children were attending school in urban areas, one-half in the suburbs, and considerably fewer in the bush. 'The colony swarms with petty schools', he said; but the conductors of many were semi-literate old men or labourers' wives, acting as baby-minders rather than pedagogues. Pupil numbers rose appreciably as feast-days and prize-days came around. Such data echoed Reeve's *Australian Era* article and many, many other lamentations over the disregard for learning.⁸ Nor should the high ideals of the best teachers hide the tragi-comic reality experienced by most. The school on Duntroon estate probably excelled many, yet Charles Campbell found the pupils ludicrously ignorant.⁹ A broader mark of culture's failure to bring 'individualization' to all was the growth of urban mobs, especially in Sydney. Earlier chapters have touched on their role in religion and politics, but the Cabbage-Tree Hat gang often pursued rowdiness for its own sake, while on New Year's Eve 1850 rioters overwhelmed the police and ruled Sydney for a few hours.

Similar contradictions marked the popular reaction to science. There was some real interest. Men heatedly debated the preferable steamship route to Britain; a public holiday (3 July 1850) celebrated the opening of work on the Sydney-Parramatta railway; balloon ascents attracted many spectators; and the first large-scale illustration in the Australian

press showed a flying machine recently constructed in Britain.¹⁰ But vulgar curiosity and material interest explained much of this reaction. Gipps commented that the Botanic Gardens enjoyed popularity only as a place of relaxation; while for all the interest in medical science, the common people consumed vast quantities of Holloway's pills, advertised to cure everything from venereal disease to tuberculosis.¹¹

General literary culture was more obviously successful. A Presbyterian clergyman, David Mackenzie, commented upon the 'immense number of books of a certain class read throughout the colony. Everybody reads.'¹² He exaggerated, but not grossly. One traveller described how shepherds crammed together to hear *Nicholas Nickleby* read aloud; Alexander Harris believed that an itinerant bookseller would prosper wonderfully in the bush. The proliferation of newspapers, an outstanding feature of these societies, proved that their audience was receptive. The Reverend T. J. Ewing was amazed and proud that 214,877 journals went through the Tasmanian post in 1841.¹³ Several newspapers sought an audience beyond the educated *bourgeoisie*; so too did the *Australian Penny Journal* and, outstandingly, *Heads of the People*.

John McGarvie said of the power of the press:

times are widely different from the last Century. Then the church and pulpit were the vehicles of knowledge, now it is the daily Press. Men are less evangelic for Religion. They hear a Sermon, but read Six newspapers weekly, the Bible never. The voice of the people was echoed by the Minister, now the Editor is the organ of politics and liberty.¹⁴

Just as many apostles of culture tended to exaggerate how far the colonies fell short of their ideal, so McGarvie approached the other extreme. Yet his judgment carried weight, as did J. S. Prout's opinion concerning popular artistic taste. In the Sydney of 1839, Prout declared ten years later, some homes were elegant, but generally 'love of ornament' found expression in 'vulgarly coloured scriptural prints, sporting subjects, unwieldy oxen, etc. etc.'. But, Prout continued, his Institute lectures attracted enthusiastic audiences, and the success of public exhibitions marked further progress. Retailers found it worth while to import high quality art materials; engravings from Landseer, Wilkie, and Turner replaced garish prints.¹⁵

What of the institutes, most determinedly popular of all cultural media? Nadel has argued that they failed, especially in bringing education to the workingman. Certainly they never realized their loftier ambitions, and finally faded into decay. By then, however, primary education had made adult instruction less necessary: before 1850 there *was* a working-class response. Even the Melbourne and Sydney institutes, which more than most remained *bourgeois* reserves, were described respectively as 'supported by all classes, and tolerably well attended by the operatives', and 'numerously attended by all grades of society, from

the Governor down to the chimney sweep'.¹⁶ Evidently the institutes had succeeded not only in winning the masses, but also in fusing social classes together. At Lillie's inaugural Institute address in Hobart the pit and stalls of the Victoria Theatre were occupied irrespective of rank. The (fairly successful) movement for shorter hours among drapers' and other shop assistants also redounded to the new faith. The assistants said that they needed leisure in which to become educated and moral citizens, and showed their good faith by raising their own self-improvement societies.

Still more interesting, although at odds with the claim to heal all sectional antipathy, was the rise of leftist consciousness concerning the diffusion of culture. This theme traced back to the foundation of the Sydney Institute, in which a group of Sydney artisans, including the radical Richard Hipkiss, took the lead.¹⁷ In 1841-2 the debating group of this Institute demanded permission to discuss political issues and broke away when refused it. The leading spirit in the Melbourne Debating Club later in the decade was William Clifford, the old soldier who so detested the régimes established throughout Europe in 1815. Another pertinent Melbournian was Mr Tankard, who led the working-class meeting which discussed the celebration of Separation. Against those who would prohibit all assisted migration, Tankard's faction wanted the construction of a hall devoted to Temperance and education. It carried the meeting.

Brisbane also contributed an episode, for William Langridge, the chief working-class spokesman there, was also secretary of the Institute. Rumour alleged that that body was a hot-bed of radicalism. Duncan at first denied this criticism, but later withdrew from the presidency because of the democratic, turbulent tone of several leading members.¹⁸ Even more interesting was the establishment (1849-50) of the Van Diemen's Land Mechanics' School of Arts, as distinct from the Hobart Institute. It aimed to teach simply reading and writing; operatives alone managed its affairs; and one leader was William Jeffrey, the unionist-politician. Meanwhile Hawksley had prompted similar moves in Sydney, but they came to nothing.

* * *

Temperance, too, evoked response from the workingman. Both Tankard (wonderful name!) and Jeffrey supported it. Jeffrey was prominent in the 1846 split among the Hobart abstainers, which involved antagonism between the respectability, led by Bonwick and Walker, and the proletarians. Similar feeling disrupted the Australian Total Abstinence Society in Sydney in 1842. Rank-and-file members were warned against allying themselves with power-seeking gentry and urged to think of themselves as the productive, vital part of the community. 'The society was the working-man's society', said one speaker at the general meeting in August, 'they did not want gentlemen among

them.¹⁹ George Allen ceased to be president, and soon after helped found the Sydney Total Abstinence Society.

This turbulence, like that within the institutes, contradicted the idea that the new faith would unite all groups in harmony. Nonetheless, such episodes proved moral enlightenment's success in attracting the common man. Bonwick himself, perhaps meaning to apologize to his erstwhile opponents, was to recall the true popularity of the movement in its early days. In Australia as elsewhere, teetotalism was largely the creation of the working class. In both fostering techniques of organization and implanting a sense of respectability the movement contributed much to modern democracy. Not only Roman Catholics were aware of this political aspect; Poyser, for example, recognized it explicitly.²⁰

Already some details have shown that pledge-signers formed a sizeable sect and that 'exalted enthusiasm' was common among them. Glimpses into the private life of teetotallers confirmed that the creed meant much to its disciples. Governor FitzRoy, requested to provide information concerning Rosina Spence, an emigrant girl, reported that she and her husband were living in teetotal bliss; Michael Monaghan, an Irishman in Rigney's parish, stressed his membership of the teetotallers when urging his wife to join him; J. F. Mortlock, a gentleman convict in Tasmania, wrote this affirmation of moral enlightenment:

economy being the order of the day, my humble deposits in the savings bank slowly accumulated. Abstinence from all fermented liquors was no sacrifice; fine clothes had ceased to be appropriate. Excepting a slight subscription to the Mechanic's Institute, I only indulged myself with a healthy ramble. . . .²¹

Multiply such experiences a few hundred times, and the sum becomes large.

Despite leftist consciousness, despite the sectarian divisions within the movement, despite further quarrels instigated by Rechabites in both colonies, Temperance did have some success in welding society together. Other signatories to the pledge on which Gipps put his name included a woman, a menial servant, at least one Roman Catholic, other Irishmen, and semi-literates. As late as 1848 Boyce and McEncroe joined on a Temperance platform, showing that the existence of denominational societies did not prohibit co-operation. Charles Harpur and his brother Joseph continued close despite the latter's conversion to Rome, for they still shared belief in Temperance (through which Joseph, under Father Lynch's influence, had come to the Church) and in such other aspects of the new faith as national education. A wider-ranging tribute to moral enlightenment came from H. P. Fry, his Tractarian beliefs notwithstanding. In 1845 he wrote that Tasmania

is not disturbed by processions of Socialists or assemblies of their organised thousands cheering with loud acclamation the expression

of atheism and blasphemy. The lower classes of our society evince a more hopeful inclination, by attendance at Temperance Assemblies and meetings of Mechanics' Institutions.²²

This evidence scarcely indicates whether Temperance succeeded in regenerating popular habits. Most supporters would have led upright lives irrespective of the organized movement; many joined simply to set a good example. 'When a sober man and all his family are included in the list of converts', commented the *Examiner*, 'it may be set down to the progress of opinions, but not of morals.'²³ Change of opinion is important, but Temperance claimed to be achieving more. Any firm conclusion is inhibited by a still greater obstacle: the ambivalence of the relation between Temperance activity and the prevailing moral climate. The *Examiner* comment suggested that a powerful movement would denote a community already upholding moral precepts. On the other hand, Temperance might logically be strong where drunkenness and other laxity abound: conversely, the movement's decline in Sydney at the end of the forties might have been the bitter-sweet result of some success. Few contemporaries could deliver knowledgeable and impartial judgment. Even G. W. Walker probably exaggerated when he wrote from Hobart (1845) that Temperance had 'wrought a complete change in the circumstances, character and prospects of, I believe I may say, hundreds in this town'.²⁴ A Sydney police officer anxious to stress his own efficiency was no better witness when claiming increased sobriety than was a quick-moving tourist ready to assert that 'drink, drink, drink' was the 'universal motto' in that city.²⁵

Many people still got drunk; Mrs Dalgarno attracted hecklers ('where's your breeches?') as well as converts; plenty of readers enjoyed journals such as *Bell's Life*, which stood for all that moral enlightenment opposed. Nevertheless drunkenness does seem to have lessened. Charles Windeyer, speaking as Sydney's police magistrate, said in 1844:

I think the offence of drunkenness has diminished; that the Temperance Societies have been doing a great deal of good; and that distress has been doing still more; the inability to purchase the indulgence has been, I think, one of the main causes.²⁶

A committee which enquired (1849) into the decline in revenue from the Tasmanian liquor trade reversed this emphasis, noticing the impact of a current recession but underlining changed drinking habits. Whereas a few years before pounds would be squandered on rum, 'now, a man more frequently calls for a moderate quantity of beer, which he divides with his companion; and there is, comparatively speaking, no immoderate treating'.²⁷ Westgarth showed that the Melbourne police courts heard strikingly fewer charges for drunkenness each succeeding year in the early forties; Roman Catholic societies won applause for the decrease of alcoholic rowdyism on St Patrick's Day. Probably Bonwick used

the happiest phrase when he spoke of a developing 'national feeling of respect for temperance'.²⁸

The movement's impact on official policy was greatest in New South Wales during Gipps's government. At his first general meeting (1838) the Governor told the Temperance Society that he would introduce legislation to regulate the trade, although severe measures, he feared, would encourage evasion. The statutes duly went through Council,²⁹ against the opposition of local distillers. During 1839 the legislature received many petitions urging that local distillation be prohibited, and a committee enquired into the subject. It supported the move, as a first step towards more thorough restriction. The issue never came to a general vote, indicating that the committee's opinion was not general. But the Temperance viewpoint continued to influence Gipps, tearing him away from the commonsense administrative position. In 1840-1 the Governor increased the excise on all spirits to what he probably hoped would prove a near-prohibitive level (maximum, twelve shillings per gallon).³⁰ This bold stroke must have caused Gipps many worried hours. At first he claimed success in having reduced consumption; yet evidence mounted that while the revenue shrank, smuggling and illicit distillation grew. The alternative had to be faced: still sterner repression or withdrawal to moderate excise. After planning to enforce the former policy, the Governor instead sent down a Bill which cut duties by half (1843). Saunders protested; Gipps, vacillating, clearly was pleased to recommend disallowance of his own measure when the Council converted it into the corn-protection law. This could only postpone a climax, however, and two years later excise came down to three shillings and sixpence per gallon.³¹ Quasi-prohibition had failed.

Yet Temperance men had some reason for satisfaction. The Tasmanian government forbade local distillation in 1838: a fiscal measure, but upheld by teetotallers. Gipps stopped the issue of rum to Imperial troops and inspired an Act which encouraged the manufacture of wine as a check against spirit-drinking. Further legislation answered Adam's plea that aborigines should have shelter from the white man's curse. Gipps's statutes of 1838-9 were but part of a very long history of increasing control over the trade. In Tasmania both Franklin and Denison attempted to restrict the number of public houses, though with small success. Especially in Melbourne the pressure on the magistrates' courts to issue licences with care was effective. Governments gave support of another kind when they purchased Temperance publications for distribution among convicts and issued land grants for Temperance halls.

* * *

Official action in consonance with moral enlightenment went well beyond control of the liquor trade. Time and again the legislatures propagated the 'true religion' view of Christianity. Bourke's Church Act invoked 'morals' as well as 'religion', and that emphasis grew steadily.

Denison's education policy was a victory for traditional Christianity; but against this stood multi-establishment, the Marriage Acts, general cemeteries, a near-secular University, and a decision not to have prayers read in the New South Wales legislature. Politicians avidly criticized the Denominational Schools' Board, while the government required teachers under the National system to evince not 'Christian belief' or 'Christian zeal' but 'Christian sentiment'. Popular representatives exceeded the government in such matters. Wentworth and J. P. Robinson lashed opponents of general cemeteries, for example, showing none of Grey's sympathy for Broughton's protest. Wentworth, Lowe, and Richard Windeyer led the majority who urged that state aid extend to Jews: the local executive was willing to agree, but Grey and James Stephen were not. The only New South Wales legislator who stood firmly against this tide was Charles Cowper, true to his election platform of 1843.

Concern for morality increasingly affected public administration. Tasmanian history provided two early illustrations. In 1835 the convict transport *George III* ran aground in D'Entrecasteaux Channel, 134 deaths resulting. Rumours spread that immediately after the disaster the military guard had shot convicts down as they strove to burst above decks. A commission of enquiry examined these allegations and found them proved, tragic, yet not directly censurable. Four years later public opinion rose high when the principal of the government Orphan School in Hobart accused his second master of inhuman whipping. After a tortuous, angry controversy, both men left the institution.

In Sydney the drive towards purity much affected police matters. Bourke and Gipps both paid this issue attention, but only with the appointment of a Council committee in 1847 did great interest arise. Witnesses stressed the need for higher standards, especially in the quality of the ordinary policemen. Over the next two years successive heads of the force, W. A. Miles and J. L. Innes, were dismissed for inefficiency. In 1850 another committee sat, while one W. C. Mayne prepared an independent report to Council. The result was an Act which centralized the administration of the force and imposed minimum conditions for the constabulary. Both Governor FitzRoy and the *Australian Era* ranked police reform as a highly significant issue of the 1850 session. Meanwhile the administration of Darlinghurst gaol (Sydney) had come within the legislature's critical purview and its Governor, Henry Keck, gone the way of Miles and Innes. Witnesses to the pertinent committee alleged that prisoners had an easy life indeed, enjoying the government's bounty while engaged in lucrative manufacture of cabbage-tree hats. But the sanitary condition of the gaol and its educational facilities also attracted the legislators' notice. Lowe's enquiry into the city corporation (1849) professed to aim at corruption and inefficiency: that he had some ulterior motives did not deny all good faith in this.

In 1843-4 police in Sydney suppressed three smut-and-scandal sheets;

the editor of one, T. R. Johnson (later connected with *Bell's Life*) was sentenced to two years' gaol for obscene libel. The first charge in Sydney against a seller of obscene prints came unsuccessfully before the magistrates late in 1844. New South Wales law regulated public bathing and the conduct of gaming houses, while Tasmanians who conducted places of entertainment or travelled on steamboats also came under restraint. Both colonies legislated to enforce some Sabbath observance, and against cruelty to animals.

The greater part of paternalist legislation aimed at improving public health, a subject on which feeling ran high. The corporation's unpopularity and vulnerability owed much to its poor record in improving sanitation. One major witness before Lowe's committee was Dr Isaac Aaron, a political radical and the colonies' nearest counterpart to Edwin Chadwick. Still earlier (1848) the legislature had established a general abattoir in Sydney, ending the practice of every butcher having his own slaughter-house. Probably in response to the criticism of 1849, the corporation itself considered appointing a Board of Health and constructing public baths. Various acts referred to public lavatories, sewerage, safety regulations on steamboats, sanitation in factories, and other elements of public decency. In 1838 and 1849 legislative committees enquired into the medical profession of New South Wales. Statutory Boards regulated physicians' standards in both colonies.

The government maintained public hospitals as part of the convict system, and thither the poor could resort. As transportation to the senior colony ceased, the administration, almost coerced by public opinion, began to subsidize civil hospitals. From 1847 Sydney had a government-sponsored vaccine institution, and various other charities in that city enjoyed official bounty. But attracting more attention, and prompting clearer expression of the time-spirit, was the lunatic asylum at Tarban Creek, near Parramatta.³² Erected in 1836, the asylum had as its first manager J. T. Digby, a humane and dedicated man. Nevertheless frequent criticism (tainted with jobbery) alleged that he treated the lunatics in crude and barbaric fashion. In 1843 an Act specified conditions of detention at the asylum; in 1846 the legislature appointed a committee of enquiry which reported in terms of profound sympathy for the insane. Not only discipline attracted notice, but also health, cleanliness, and the provision of books. The report caused administrative changes, some contemporaries seeing therein promise of a new era. Most important was the appointment as superintendent of Dr Francis Campbell, the disciple of phrenology and a man who believed philanthropic work to be 'divine'.³³ He set out to prove his faith in absolute non-coercion, believing (like Maconochie) that sympathetic treatment could transform men often considered beyond redemption. Campbell never became disillusioned, and looked back on his work as 'the conversion of a hell into a heaven'.³⁴ The same concern prevailed in Tasmania. Important factors were the presence

of Bishop Willson, an Act of 1847 similar to that of 1843 in New South Wales, and John Morgan's insistence that forward-looking principles determine the administration of asylums, hospitals, and gaols.

Meanwhile popular life had kept pace with this public endorsement of the new faith in its broader aspects. Although freemasonry never became so potent a storm-guard of liberalism as in Europe, it played some part in politics,³⁵ and a few magazines and newspapers directed their appeal thither. Lodges sprang up everywhere. Other institutional organs of moral enlightenment were charitable societies. The historian has available a thorough study of those in Sydney,³⁶ while its counterpart for Hobart would refer to the Maternal and Dorcas Society (so old-fashioned as to heed members who opposed education of the poor), and to the Hobart Town Dispensary and General Humane Society. In 1851 eight towns in New South Wales had general benevolent groups; Victoria and Tasmania together probably equalled the tally. Personal distress and public calamity (bushfires, depression, above all the British famine of 1845-6) prompted generous giving.

Sectarianism did sometimes arise within aid societies, but more as the exception than the rule. For the rest, charity provided scope for men of different faiths to join together and for expression of that fraternal love so dear to the new faith. To one traveller the charitable institutions of Sydney were compelling evidence 'that the energies of a great community and an enlightened people are struggling to advance the public good'.³⁷ Moreover, while the forms of the charities mentioned above were traditional, working within them were elements of change peculiarly akin to moral enlightenment. The Sydney Benevolent Society presented its work as the strongest barrier against a Poor law; at its asylum was imposed 'a strict and humiliating discipline for . . . moral improvement'.³⁸ The Hobart Dispensary bowed to the ideal of encouraging 'self-respect and self-support' among the people.³⁹ Most of the famine relief fund went to subsidize not doles, but emigration. These trends smacked of hypocritical arrogance in the manner of Samuel Smiles, but again the idea that the working class could and must achieve respectability was of central importance. Harpur's 'individualization' and Channing's belief (quoted by colonial thinkers) in the glory of voluntary association to remedy social ills taught a lesson much the same as Smiles's self-help. As the common man answered this call so he acted in the light of moral enlightenment.

And help himself he did. The number of benefit societies within the colonies was well beyond computation. Members of a common trade, or district, or congregation, or masonic lodge, or Temperance society, banded together for this purpose. These clubs generally hoped to provide security from the cradle to the grave as well as a social centre, insurance fund, and savings bank. Doyen of groups with general membership was the Australian Union Benefit Society, in the foundation of which

(Sydney, 1834) the radicals led by Hipkiss had again played a part. In 1849 the Australian Mutual Provident Society set out on its successful history. 'A poor law degrades the character of a man', said an early A.M.P. statement, 'but Life Assurance or a Deferred Annuity, exalts and improves it.'⁴⁰ The Melbourne Union Benefit Society, from which the local Mechanics' Institute sprang, expressed the same idea, while Isaac Aaron supported the Constitutional Association's demand for a lower franchise by alluding to the responsible attitude of the potential electors, shown by their membership of benefit societies.⁴¹ The statute book recognized the importance of these societies by giving them legal personality.

Governments, do-gooders, and individual doctors helped provide medical relief, but not to the exclusion of all self-help. Late in 1840 a co-operative hospital opened in Hobart, contributors paying threepence per week. 'Many of the labouring classes of Society', declared the prospectus, 'are prevented seeking Medical advice, from the want of means, or the objection to resort to a Public Hospital as objects of Charity.'⁴² W. R. Pugh later founded a similar organization at Launceston, aiming to establish higher standards than prevailed in the government establishment. Neither venture met with great success, but neither did the vaccine institution, partly because most workers were happy to pay a doctor's fee. The civil public hospitals could not have begun or continued without popular support; an Act of 1848 vested legal personality in ten such institutions in New South Wales outside Sydney.

Savings banks were very important in the history of self-help. They too depended initially on philanthropists or government, yet had no reason for continued existence but the workingman's support. This flowed generously. The accountant of the Sydney Savings Bank told a legislative committee in 1840 that mechanics, servants, and labourers were his chief customers, and that their number constantly increased. 'A great many' Sydney artisans had from fifty to one hundred pounds deposited; some saved their whole wage beyond paying for food and board.⁴³ Supervision of the Hobart Bank was among G. W. Walker's good works, and a very satisfying one. 'Few things would tend more even to the moral welfare of our working classes here', he wrote home of the proposed Bank early in 1845, '... especially now that hundreds, nay thousands, are discontinuing their visits to the public house, and begin to find that money remains in their pockets.'⁴⁴ The link with Temperance prevailed also at Launceston, where successive managers of the bank, Henry Dowling and Isaac Sherwin, were ardent teetotallers; at Campbell Town, Tasmania, where the one organization was both bank and Temperance Society; and in a different way at Sydney when the suggestion arose that jealous publicans abetted the 'run' of 1843. The importance of the bank showed in the crisis that then developed, 'society appearing for the time as if it had been violently torn off its hinges'.⁴⁵ The quiet passing of the situation credited the sober wisdom of depositors, as did the similar reso-

lution of a 'run' in Launceston two years later. Journalists and governors forever quoted the prosperity of the banks as evidence of general well-being.

On one such occasion the *Herald* remarked that among the fruits of the depositors' providence were 'the humble cottages springing up in thick clusters in the Surry Hills, at Chippendale, at Pyrmont, at Balmain'.⁴⁶ John West noticed the determination of immigrant labourers to build their individual small homes, while the Crown auctioneer in Sydney believed that the common desire to secure a little 'heritable property' was the best counter of intemperance there.⁴⁷ So the atmosphere encouraged the development of building societies—which Mr Jones from the Huon compared with Temperance, and which the *Hobarton Guardian*, the *People's Advocate*, and the *Temperance Banner* all welcomed as ancillary to their causes. About a dozen groups had formed by 1850, Melbourne claiming at least four. Observers praised their disarming of Red Republicans, Levellers, and Socialists, by spreading property ownership throughout society. Statutes of both colonies protected building societies, banks, and also art unions which applied the principle of self-help to culture.

Not only did schools spread, drunkenness diminish, benevolence and self-help thrive, but probably the general level of morality rose. In 1841 Gipps commented:

The ordinary proprieties of Society are observed amongst the better portion of the population of New South Wales, in as great and perhaps in a greater degree than amongst persons of the same class elsewhere. The fear indeed of being suspected of the taint of Convictism operates in a wholesome manner as a restraint upon those who are free from it.⁴⁸

Two Tasmanian gentry argued similarly concerning the island.⁴⁹ Many allegedly immoral practices came under censure—the recognition in society of bastard children, the prevalence of brothels, banks raising capital through lotteries. The private papers of George Allen, of the gentry-squatter Russell family, and of Chief Justice Dowling throb with passion for moral rectitude. The charge of sexual immorality which helped cause Eardley-Wilmot's dismissal was not unique. The *Atlas* explicitly accused one Captain Cockburn of seducing a Parramatta girl. Governor FitzRoy and his sons came under such heavy suspicion of misconduct that David Blair remembered it as one of the outstanding features of Sydney in 1850. Sometimes moralistic feeling became ludicrous: an Institute lecturer blushed at Shakespeare's indelicacy, and a lady novelist enquired whether bullock-drivers had ever really *tried* to manage their charges without swearing.⁵⁰ Conversely, both Charles and Joseph Harpur broke their pledges and succumbed to their baser impulses. Cant, deception, self-advancement, pharisaical conceit—all became associated with moral enlightenment. Yet in so lush a growth as the new faith some rank-

ness was inevitable, and should not obscure the quality of the underlying soil. Conventions and opinion changed more than behaviour, but human affairs allowed no other result.

* * *

Jurisprudence is a crucial element in every society, and the impact of moral enlightenment upon it strikingly indicated the power of the new faith in eastern Australia. Police reform was pertinent here, for it illustrated the theme that if moral, rational, principles determined the law, then a law-abiding society would come much closer. Especially in New South Wales colonial politicians strove to emulate the British law reformers. Lowe, Richard Windeyer, and a Port Phillip representative named E. J. Brewster took the lead, while the executive assisted effectively. Many of the issues were technical—recovery of small debts, administration of insolvent estates, conveyancing freehold, administration of grant deeds, the law relating to real property. Jury reform had more immediate relevance. In 1844 Windeyer carried through a statute which prescribed that in civil cases a majority of nine jurors to three would suffice after six hours' deliberation; after twelve hours the jury would disband. An Act of 1847 carried the majority principle further, and won the *Herald's* applause for striking against the perjury and concealment of opinion encouraged by the unanimity rule.⁵¹ Underlying such reform were the confidence in rational judgment and impatience with tradition so typical of the new faith.

Still louder echoes of moral enlightenment permeated moves to remodel the legal profession, moves which often implied that many victims of the law were really victims of the lawyers. Thus John Morgan's *Tasmanian Weekly Dispatch* condemned 'the senseless jargon of the Courts, the wig and gown fooleries'; while Gipps himself was rebuked by a professional association in Sydney for having encouraged 'vulgar and vague prejudices' of this sort.⁵² A Tasmanian statute regulated the qualifications of attorneys as early as 1840; the procedure of even the New South Wales Supreme Court came under the scrutiny of a legislative committee in 1845. But the overriding liberal concern in the senior colony was to abolish the division between barristers and solicitors, which vested hateful privilege in the former and allegedly swelled the expense of litigation. Brewster introduced a Bill to end the division in 1846. It was referred to a committee which reported in September 1847 that subsidiary reforms (especially provision for training local youths as barristers) were alone necessary. This clearly represented Wentworth's opinion as against that of Lowe, T. A. Murray, and perhaps other members of the committee.⁵³ Wentworth carried an Act to this effect through the legislature in 1848, defeating a final attempt by Murray to achieve more radical reform. The barristers retained their status, perhaps for good and sufficient reasons, but in violation of the liberal ethos.

Legislation included several references to the treatment of convicted persons. Imprisonment for debt ('oppressive and unnecessary') ceased to apply in the majority of cases. Several New South Wales Acts ameliorated the punishment of women—by exempting them from the dark cell, from the fiercer penalties of the Master and Servant legislation, and from the summary clauses of a Bushranging Act. Capital punishment was struck out as the nominal punishment for sheep and cattle stealing in Tasmania; and for riotous destruction of property, forgery, and comparable offences in New South Wales. G. R. Nichols sponsored an Act which provided for the education of infant criminals. Though rather limited, these measures were the public expressions of more widespread popular feeling which sought to bring even the wrongdoer within the new faith.

The chief prophet of this doctrine was Alexander Maconochie, student of phrenology and upholder of the Owenite maxim that 'good men may be made by good management'.⁵⁴ Believing that 'the communication of moral impulses to the human mind' promised vast benefits, he set his penological work alongside advances in education, in treatment of the insane, and in physical science. Maconochie had many colonial admirers, among them F. M. Innes, Lady Franklin, and R. L. Murray. He lost his position as commandant at Norfolk Island in unhappy circumstances, but by then had already contributed to Australian intellectual and sociological history.

Other men with colonial connexions added to penal thought. As surgeon on several convict transports C. A. Browning organized a system of education, Christian instruction, and collective discipline which aimed at regeneration. 'This day commences a new era in your existence', he told his charges at the beginning of their voyage; and proceeded to describe his plan 'which contemplates you as intellectual and moral beings; as beings who are capable of making great attainments; who necessarily exert an incalculable influence, good or bad, upon each other, upon mankind, and upon the moral universe.'⁵⁵ H. P. Fry never tackled practical problems as did Maconochie and Browning, but equal compassion and perhaps more balanced wisdom determined his thinking. In 1850 he published a study which stressed the need of 'placing criminals under new relations, and submitting them to the influence of the natural expectations and prospects of men in a healthy state of society'. Fry urged the classification of criminals, strictly measured punishments, and the diffusion of education. 'Crime is generally the result of necessity', he argued; relieve destitution, and the criminal type would stand unmasked.⁵⁶

Feeling against harsh, vindictive punishments saturated all thought on this subject, and was widely current. As early as 1836 a legislative committee had required facilities for 'complete separation and classification' in the Darlinghurst gaol, which accordingly followed the famous Philadelphia penitentiary.⁵⁷ Like its counterpart of 1849, this committee was concerned for the welfare of inmates, especially their cleanliness. Just before his dismissal Keck had won high praise from *Heads of the People*

for the way in which humanity determined conditions within the gaol. Reformers like Alexander Harris and John Morgan abominated indiscriminate flogging. In *The Emigrant Family* Harris had one of his characters argue that over-punishment led to 'felon fraternity' against society at large. That colonial courts imposed over-severe sentences was a major and constant theme of the *Atlas* newspaper.

Such feeling culminated in opposition to capital punishment. Hostility to public executions (attendance at which ranked as the ultimate anti-rational amusement) and the Benthamite view that in prevailing conditions the death penalty served little purpose both contributed to this view, but most abolitionists felt a deeper passion. 'I believe', said Charles Harpur in preface to an adulatory poem addressed to Barzillai Quaife after he had given two public lectures on the subject, 'that to be an advocate for abolition of capital punishments, *upon any ground*, is one of the highest proofs a man could possibly give of his being in full fellowship with the better spirit of the age.'⁵⁸ A further consequence of the lectures was a rebuttal from J. B. Laughton, who drew heavily from the Scriptures. Quaife attempted to reply in the same terms, but not convincingly: again the new faith clashed with traditional Christianity.

Quaife and Harpur both published in the *Atlas*, which upheld the abolitionist cause. Lowe continued vehement on this subject, joining in 1849 with G. R. Nichols to vote against an allowance for the public hangman. N. L. Kentish also campaigned against capital punishment, believing that 'advancement in Knowledge and Virtue, in true Religion and Happiness' demanded its cessation. Kentish's efforts to work up a public protest misfired, but debating societies often considered the issue, and petitions in favour of reprieving particular criminals sometimes went around. The most dramatic case concerned a Tasmanian bushranger, Lawrence Kavenagh; when Eardley-Wilmot granted a reprieve, Judge Montagu publicly criticized him.

Explanation for the Impact

Ideas about penological reform helped prompt the anti-transportation movement, and so did many other aspects of moral enlightenment. To this extent the movement showed the impact of the new faith, as did all efforts to populate Australia not with convicts and coolies but young, married Britons. But the crusade against transportation had a unique, transcending quality. 'It remains now to record the most important colonial agitation of modern times', wrote West, introducing his chapter on the movement.⁵⁹ He did not exaggerate. So the arguing of the issue in terms of moral enlightenment probably went beyond explaining 'how far' the creed had pervaded society, to answer the deeper problem 'why so far'. When both parties to a great public debate appeal to the same principles, those principles firmly grip the popular mind.

From the very beginning of the period, critics of transportation put

forward arguments consonant with moral enlightenment. In his *History . . . of Van Diemen's Land*, published in 1835, Henry Melville argued that the system degraded the colonies, without transmitting any real benefit. It failed to impose an exemplary punishment or to encourage reformation—convicts had too easy a life so long as they did not offend colonial law; having done so, they had to endure the all-corrupting misery of Port Arthur. Murray's *Review* echoed this argument, alleging widespread homosexual abuses at the penal stations. 'Upon what possible principle', it demanded in 1836, 'can Transportation, under the present frightfully atrocious system, be endured by the enlightened and philanthropic men in whose hands are the destinies of the British nation?'⁶⁰ The Molesworth Committee answered that the current system must cease. Colonial witnesses stressed the moral evils of the system—Macarthur, demonstrating that the exclusives' case rested on an ethical basis; Ullathorne, with horrific stories of Norfolk Island; J. D. Lang, anticipating the enmity of orthodox radicalism to the convict heritage. Despite the changes consequent upon the Molesworth report, debates on transportation continued to incorporate such themes. Eardley-Wilmot's dismissal owed something to charges that sodomy raged in the probation camps, Fry describing these in terms very similar to Ullathorne's account of Norfolk. William Westgarth, again the social scientist, was among those who criticized the exile system because it threw criminals of every type together, rendering reformation impossible. John Saunders, James Aikenshead (proprietor of the *Examiner*), and many others argued that the government must do more to remedy crime than shovel out transgressors to Australia.

Increasingly, enemies of transportation stressed its effect on the community at large. Hundreds of illustrative passages remain in the record. From London a colonial pressure group denounced transportation as

an evil of stupendous and vital moment, not only, (although more immediately,) to the free colonists of Van Diemen's Land, and the wretched convicts themselves, but to this whole nation and all humanity.⁶¹

Melbourne's citizenry rejected Grey's proposals to mix free and convict emigration with the declaration that

no motives of expediency can ever reconcile them to the moral evils which must arise from the association with convicted felons of the mother country; . . . the good effects arising from the great efforts that are being made to extend educational and religious institutions throughout the district, will, in a great measure, be neutralized by the introduction of a felon population.⁶²

A pamphlet issued in Launceston thus depicted the struggle:

to clear away the ruins of a long-existing social state, and to build anew, is at least a formidable undertaking, however certain of ultimate

reward. The reflecting abolitionist knows all this . . . [yet] for the sake of our children—for the sake of our workmen—for the sake of political freedom, we have encountered these alarms, and ventured on the unknown futurity.⁶³

Hobart abolitionists told Grey that:

Despotic rulers have often invaded the temporal interests of their subjects, but it remained for your Lordship and the ministry of which you are a member to present the first example of a constitutional Government invading and destroying the moral interests of a community.⁶⁴

In such passages moral enlightenment echoed loudly. The same wish for regeneration accompanied the same concern to build society on principles of unalloyed purity. West's Australasian League sought to create a spirit of nationalism; it at least succeeded in uniting the movement throughout the colonies and in prompting Harpur's characteristic 'Anthem to the Australasian League':

Shall we sing of Loyalty
To the far South's fiery youth?
Yea—but let the paean be
Of loyalty to God and Truth:
To Man, to progress and to all
The free things, nobly free,
Of which their loved Australia shall
The golden cradle be.⁶⁵

Further parallels with the new faith appeared in the movement's stress on the welfare of children and its appeal to women. Mrs Dalgarno spoke publicly in the cause, and 8,506 members of her sex signed a special petition to the New South Wales legislature. Like Temperance men and educationists, spokesmen for the movement emphasized the need for a contented, morally healthy proletariat: 'I never heard it advanced (till of late in this country)', gibed the Reverend S. Martin, an opponent of the crusade, 'that the bad example or bad morals of the lower ranks infected the higher.'⁶⁶ Publicans indicated the link between Temperance and anti-transportation by fighting both.⁶⁷ The support of the *Australian Era* and *Illustrated Australian Magazine* expressed the benediction of culture for the campaign. Representatives of every interest save squatting backed the cause. It thus realized the new faith ideal of common action towards a noble aim.

Just as Launceston was a focus for other aspects of moral enlightenment, so the local anti-transportation movement had particular interest. Thence came West's book and the organization of the League. The *Examiner* published 'Thirty Nine Articles against the Continuance of Transportation', while townsmen staged a protest fast—blasphemous touches reminiscent of Temperance.⁶⁸ Associations against convict em-

ployment bound the two movements yet tighter, for members *pledged* their adherence and compared the non-employment of post-1849 arrivals with moderate Temperance, complete non-employment of convicts with abstinence.

Criticism of the abolitionists also followed a path made familiar by discussion of the new faith. From Earl Grey downwards came charges of hypocrisy and jobbery. The bandwagon certainly rolled towards abolition: only the selfless or stupid labourer or politician would throw himself in its way. Abolitionists showed confusion by sometimes congratulating themselves on spurning a system which made for prosperity, sometimes asserting that the end of transportation would introduce unbounded wealth. Furthermore, the principles of moral enlightenment could *defend* the system. New South Wales emancipists in the thirties and later the Tasmanian Union accused their opponents of inhumanity, and so did more disinterested commentators. Maconochie, Innes, Kentish, and (for a while) Fry all believed that transportation might serve excellent penological ends. E. S. Hall went farthest on this road. He ever maintained that transportation had encouraged sterling virtues among convicts, and so described the Macquarie era as 'the most social, & the happiest' in New South Wales history. Hall felt that the Molesworth report had ended assignment precisely when the community had achieved a ratio between bond and free most likely to facilitate success. He offered his own services to re-establish in western New South Wales 'a system of secondary punishment into which George the third & his Ministers were led by divine Providence'.⁶⁹

The upholders of transportation proved that their opponents' interpretation of moral enlightenment was not the only one possible. Yet while showing that the new faith was so strong by mid-century as to be the touchstone for both sides in this vital debate, their own sincerity did not deny that altruistic passion was a major element in the abolitionist crusade.

* * *

The anti-transportation movement was a specific reason why moral enlightenment should become accepted in eastern Australia, but some general explanations also demand attention. They are so general indeed as to threaten platitude and tautology, but none the less potent: other parts of the world, even other parts of Australia, embraced the new faith without having to fight transportation. Nowhere has the derivative element been more obvious than in this chapter: savings banks, building societies, police and law reform all copied British models. Moral enlightenment was no more a native plant than traditional Christianity or the gentry ethos. So the first general reason why the creed pervaded so deeply is that Tasmania and New South Wales were parts of the European and especially the English-speaking world.

A second reason (although this too could rank as an indicator of

'extent' as well as 'explanation') was the common ground it offered various ideologies. Many conservative thinkers and organs, the *Herald* especially, had accepted various principles of the new faith. The penetration of traditional Christianity by moral enlightenment appeared in chapters 5 and 6 as a mark of disruption. So, from one viewpoint, it was. Yet this very penetration could and did act as a bond, linking the various denominations with society at large. In addition, many class-conscious proletarians responded to the call, while even the gentry ideal was consistent with the new faith. The intimacy of mind between Harpur, Parkes, and Duncan was remarkable and significant. Transcendental socialist, popular politician, Roman Catholic intellectual—three such different men joined in the belief that a new dispensation was imminent. Only the squatters and the High Anglicans remained outside the circle. Most other colonists strove to enlarge the ground they shared with the new faith, recognizing this as the best means of building a homogeneous society.

That New South Wales and Tasmania belonged to the new world further tightened this allegiance. Upholders of every creed felt missionary zeal when confronted with a virgin society—Anglo-Catholics no less than Temperance men. Yet inevitably conservatives felt the absence of tradition as a handicap whereas their adversaries found it a boon. Contrast the laments of Broughton and Nixon with this extract from the *Temperance Advocate* already quoted in part:

In England, in withstanding Intemperance at Christmas, we have to resist the prejudices of fathers and grandsires . . . It is not so in Australia, we are young and have a right to dictate, if we dictate well, to future generations.

The converse was for all who felt aware of the colonies as new lands to be sympathetic to a new rather than an old faith.

Charles Nicholson illustrated this sensitivity when declaring that colonial life was attractive chiefly because it gave opportunity to mould history's course. Similarly the *Australian Era*, when hailing 1850 as a year which promised man's regeneration, asserted that 'in a limited community like this . . . each of us, in our individual capacity, has . . . greater opportunity of impelling the onward march'.⁷⁰ Both the experience of migration and the fact of native birth encouraged men to see the colonies in such a light. This awareness stressed not only the colonies' freedom from tradition but also the trend to 'individualization', that confidence in Everyman's capacity to work out his own destiny which was a cornerstone of Harpur's philosophy. The same point underlay de Tocqueville's essay, 'How Equality Suggests to the Americans the Idea of the Indefinite Perfectibility of Man'. By equality in this context he meant all physical and social fluidity: as real and powerful in Australia as in America.

These remarks open up the wider issues of 'Progress'. This concept knit the new faith and colonial life still more closely, for it was the main-

spring of both. 'What Will Sustain the Country?' asked a writer in the *Australasian* magazine. 'The principle of progress', he answered himself, remarking that the concept already 'has found, in these far lands, an abiding place in the same degree secure and lasting, as the energy of the spirit of adventure and acquisition which moves the people'.⁷¹ Other commentators noticed the interdependence of this principle and the colonial environment. Every Anniversary Day, every New Year, often without formal excuse, colonists praised themselves on the transformation achieved within a few decades. Some emphasized how emigration rebutted the pessimism of Malthus, and so allowed man to exercise 'the amative propensity' without fear. A reviewer in the *New South Wales Magazine* discussed how European expansion stimulated 'new opinions, new forms of government, and social combinations such as had never hitherto been witnessed';⁷² he anticipated frontier historiography, especially W. P. Webb's 'Boom Hypothesis of Modern History' which sees this expansion as the prime cause behind the optimistic individualism of the post-Columban western world. The claim of the *Atlas* that 'the law of the institutions in a new country is, not stability, but progress' referred primarily to politics, but the *Illustrated Australian Magazine* extended the argument by urging that the coming of self-government should inspire loftier ideals in every activity.

The writer in the *Australasian* felt no shame in praising 'acquisition'. This was in keeping with the new faith's emphasis on material wellbeing, and re-emphasized that the affluence of Australian life encouraged acceptance of the creed. Fry linked the efficacy of Temperance halls and Mechanics' Institutes with Tasmania's freedom 'from the fearful evils of the Factory System and the fatal consequences of extreme poverty and excessive wealth'. Childers's report on Victorian schools and the *Australian Era*'s glorification of 'The Year 1850' pursued the same theme. The squatter H. W. Haygarth put the issue very bluntly:

in Australia, where worldly success is so immediately and so visibly the result of any reform in conduct, and where want is scarcely known, the missionary of reformation may expect a degree of success beyond what the greatest zeal and ability could obtain for the preacher who labours among the vicious part of our poorer population at home.⁷³

So bluntly, indeed, as to prompt a sneer that people and nations will ever struggle along so long as they enjoy prosperity; no faith is tested unless it has to weather hardship. But this is not a fair charge against moral enlightenment. A first principle of the creed was the mingling of 'material, mental, and moral' advance; it did not claim to be effective when any one factor was absent.

Finally, the colonial environment encouraged 'true religion' as against traditional religion. De Tocqueville, Webb, and many other historians have seen this, the former describing American antipathy to Church interference in politics and to denominational exclusivism in terms startlingly

appropriate to Australian experience. That frontier conditions strengthened the Protestant emphasis on social ethic rather than sophisticated theology was pertinent. So too were the experiences of Alexander Harris. His reports suggested that the common man, at least in the bush, looked on formal religion much as did Harpur and Hall. Further, Harris attributed to this figure traits of unity, benevolence, and resource which amounted to 'true religion' in practice. Perhaps Australia's most distinct contribution to the new faith was to develop its precepts in an environment not conceived by its European progenitors; perhaps, on the other hand, Harris was over-ready to see the triumph of principles in which he believed. The same reservation applies against E. S. Hall, Harris's precursor in expounding 'The Australian Legend' apropos the virtue of the bush worker.

Exegesis upon the Impact

The trend of this chapter has been to prove one claim of the disciples of moral enlightenment: that their creed had the power to sustain the growth of a community. By mid-century the new faith was already the supremely potent influence in both New South Wales and Tasmania. Its vocabulary provided the terms in which the great issues of the day were discussed; its *mores* were accepted as standards, if not always in day-to-day reality. Broughton had lost his battle. To strengthen the point a venture into the colonies' later years is desirable, if tortuous and not necessarily conclusive. The new faith embraced factors capable of explaining very different results; possibility of explanation does not equal truthful explanation; and there is no certainty as to what *did* happen in later Australian history.

These qualifications apply particularly to the two most pertinent issues—attitudes to morality and to education. In Australia more than in most countries propriety of behaviour has always won both respectability and respect. The wowser has scored many statutory victories, and few critics have dared deny his basic assumptions. The simple virtues evoke a popular piety, often smug and conventional, but nevertheless real. This vague mystique also enshrouds education—not for its own sake, but to make oneself or one's child a better person, one for whom progress thus becomes a reality, and who himself becomes more useful to the community. The crudity and shallowness which can develop from these attitudes showed all too clearly in the nineteenth-century debates on education, and often enough since. Yet always the central point repeats itself: this issue is capable of rousing interest and passion.

What were some other such questions? In Victoria and New South Wales the crusade against the squatters dominated politics for years. Any further explanation of why the struggle should have spread beyond political-economic reality is unnecessary. This was not merely a class war, but a holy war. Similarly with the tremendous emphasis placed on indus-

trialization and manufactures: here the new faith themes of progress, prosperity, and social intercourse were as relevant as the proletariat's demand for congenial work and the capitalists' for profitable investment. Again, in Australia the role of the state has been extensive and peculiar, 'to employ collective power to foster interests which are primarily individual'.⁷⁴ Both these characteristics relate to moral enlightenment. Educationists and Temperance men called for official intervention to help everybody attain goodness; self-help and charitable societies felt no embarrassment in seeking or receiving aid from government. George Miller, the accountant of the Sydney Savings Bank, remarked in 1841 that local banks needed much more official support than did their British counterparts. 'In a new country like this, society is very different, no division of it is fixed; a great proportion of the population are recent arrivals, and the only permanent body is the Government.'⁷⁵ This truism could not have come from any more appropriate source.

The political and still more the social character of Australia has taken much of its colour from the strong influence exercised by the working class. Again moral enlightenment is relevant, especially its stress on comprehending this sector of the community, previously ignored or patronized. That the workingman did respond thus becomes yet more significant in the light of our future knowledge. Indeed, the Australian workingman took moral enlightenment for his own. In consequence the new faith became vulgarized (as teetotalism was a vulgarized species of Temperance), and used for more plainly materialist ends (as in support of anti-transportation), and given a class-conscious edge; but these changes were peripheral. One factor facilitating the process was the absence of a strong middle class, which was thus unable to secure its logical inheritance of the new faith. John Hood, a wealthy Englishman travelling in Australia in the forties, feared lest the weakness of the colonial *bourgeoisie* would allow fierce democracy to rule unchecked. West gave the true if ostensibly paradoxical answer a few years later: 'the prevailing spirit of the colonies is democratic: the democracy of the middle classes, not of the mob'.⁷⁶ The interim had witnessed the election of Robert Lowe to represent Sydney in the New South Wales legislature. 'To the working classes alone he could turn', declared that candidate during the campaign; a campaign which was the first organized by orthodox radicalism, which set new standards of electoral purity, and which resulted in the victory of a man very different from such aspirants for working-class favour as the distiller Robert Cooper or the liquor-merchant Macdermott. Lowe's quarrel with his supporters notwithstanding, his victory symbolized the situation described by West. Only on rare occasions has the Australian workingman used his political power as a bludgeon in the class war; more often he has been concerned to realize the *bourgeois*-conceived ideals of the new faith.

Like the proletariat, women early won political privileges in Australia.

This development sprang directly from moral enlightenment, the protagonists of which not only appealed to women as had no previous creed, but believed female suffrage would serve their own political ends. Yet apart from exercising the vote, women have played little part in Australian public life. Perhaps the very triumph of the workingman fostered this situation: Temperance addressed its appeal to middle-class women and working-class men, but not to working-class women. In popular life a more appropriate picture appears, for there women are certainly effective and even dominant.

The more deeply the historian penetrates into purely social matters, the more overwhelming become ambiguities and alternatives. However, a few issues have already impinged so far as to demand explicit notice. One is the suburb, that most potent influence in everyday Australian life. Its development owed much to the passion for an industrialized society; more to self-help, as expressed through savings banks and building societies. The cult of manly, wholesome sport, certainly not unique to Australia but again particularly strong, also belongs here. Saunders, Poyser, Gipps, Braim, Kentish—these were very different men, yet devotion to moral enlightenment led all to praise cricket and athletics. The migrant's particular attachment to the new faith helps explain why periods of migration have been periods of vitality in Australian history. This important fact has been sometimes obscured by chauvinism which instead has magnified 'The Australian Legend'. But even this exaggeration affirms the potency of moral enlightenment, for the legend encompasses both a re-statement of the creed as well as a distinct local element. From this lofty question of the origins of the national image the student of the long-term impact of moral enlightenment may wend his way to such trivialities as why Australians bath more often than their British cousins (because of the climate, because of their prosperity, or because they have absorbed the idea that moral and physical purity interlock?).

All such enquiries probably will confirm that Australia's history is most significant as a test of the new faith. Here lies proof that a nation can draw strength from this teaching, and therein find authority, sufficient yet not oppressive. But what of the final and sublime claim of moral enlightenment: that such a nation must necessarily be wise and good and splendid? The debate continues. Today the heirs of Broughton detest and decry all they see about them. They have their reasons, while Harpur himself might hesitate still to 'sing of loyalty'. Yet most who see the poet as their kindred spirit will believe that here men have created a society which possesses true and distinct qualities. Those so inclined must continue to cherish the national virtue, ever hoping that the future will answer 'yes' to the ultimate belief of the new faith.

APPENDIX I

Status and Number of Persons in New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania, 1841-51, their Occupations and Religious Affiliations

STATUS AND NUMBER OF PERSONS IN NEW SOUTH WALES AND VICTORIA, 1841 AND 1851

<i>Status</i>	<i>New South Wales</i>				<i>Victoria</i>	
	<i>1841</i> <i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>1851</i> <i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>1851</i> <i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
No information	2,130					
Born in colony	14,819	14,630	}	81,226 76,695	43,006	30,784
Arrived free	30,745	22,158				
Ex-convict	15,760	3,637				
Convict	23,844	3,133		2,606 87	143	3
Total	87,298	43,558	106,229	81,014	46,202	31,143

STATUS AND NUMBER OF PERSONS IN TASMANIA, 1842 AND 1851

<i>Status</i>	<i>1842</i>		<i>1851</i>	
	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
Born in colony	6,299	6,425	10,649	10,941
Arrived free	7,761	6,731	7,615	6,970
Ex-convict	7,912	1,960	12,369	3,534
Convict	17,632	2,700	12,494	4,037
Military establishment	1,163	268	953*	
Aborigines	29	22		
Convicts on public works			568*	
Total	40,796	18,106	44,648	25,482

* Might include some females.

OCCUPATIONS, NEW SOUTH WALES AND VICTORIA, 1851

	<i>New South Wales</i>	<i>Victoria</i>
Commerce and manufacture	12,423	5,020
Agriculture	11,898	3,953
Grazing sheep	11,449	6,139
Grazing cattle	4,170	1,180
Horticulture	930	369
Other labourers	10,875	6,026
Mechanics and artificers	5,857	3,415
Male domestic servants	3,853	1,412
Female domestic servants	6,594	3,198
Ministers of religion	283	89
Legal profession	207	105
Medical profession	326	151
Other educated persons	2,188	947
Pensioners, etc.	694	146
Other occupations	6,337	3,530
Residue	109,159	41,665

OCCUPATIONS, TASMANIA, 1851

Landed proprietors, merchants, bankers, and professional	1,577
Shopkeepers	1,415
Mechanics	5,687
Farmers	2,533
Market gardeners	281
Shepherds	1,445
Gardeners, stockmen, and farm servants	9,731
Domestics	5,600
Boatmen	346
Coastal seamen	341
Whalers	42
Others	39,611

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS, 1851

<i>Denomination</i>	<i>New South Wales</i>	<i>Victoria</i>	<i>Tasmania</i>
Anglican	93,137	37,433	45,073
Presbyterian	18,156	11,608	4,485
Wesleyan	10,008	4,988	3,772
Other Protestant	6,472	4,313	2,379
Roman Catholic	56,889	18,014	12,444
Jewish	979	364	435

Sydney police district, 58,993.
Melbourne police district, 23,142.
Hobart electoral district, 23,107.

Sources: New South Wales: *L.C. Papers* 23 August 1841 and 11 November 1851; Victoria: *L.C. Papers* 13 November 1851; Tasmania: *Statistics of Van Diemen's Land for 1842-1844* (Hobart 1845), *L.C. Papers* 30 April 1851. These *L.C. Papers* are all census returns.

APPENDIX II

*Churches and Schools in New South Wales, Port Phillip, and Tasmania, 1850**

NEW SOUTH WALES (EXCLUDING PORT PHILLIP)

<i>Denominations</i>	<i>Clergy</i>	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Chapels</i>	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Pupils</i>
Anglicans	75	59	—	92	5,496
Roman Catholics	30	23	35	36	2,865
Church of Scotland					
Presbyterians	16	13	15	{ 42	2,140
Free Presbyterians	13	2	20		
Wesleyans	15	—	63	15	1,080
Congregationalists	4	—	4	—	—
Baptists	3	—	3	—	—
Jews	1	1	—	—	—

25 National Schools taught 1,507 pupils; 279 private schools taught 7,850 pupils; and the Orphan Schools (one Protestant, one Roman Catholic) taught 314 pupils.

PORT PHILLIP

Anglicans	16	4	4	24	1,840
Roman Catholics	8	3	3	13	1,064
Church of Scotland					
Presbyterians	3	2	5	{ 8	265
Free Presbyterians	3	2	7		
Wesleyans	3	—	8	5	459
Congregationalists	6	—	8	4	226
Baptists	1	—	—	—	—
Jews	1	1	—	—	—

The National Schools submitted no returns. 112 private schools taught 3,197 pupils.

TASMANIA

Anglicans	49	42	—	72	—
Roman Catholics	14	—	—	4	—
Presbyterians	13	14	—	—	—
Wesleyans	7	—	38	1	—
Congregationalists	8	—	19	—	—
Baptists	3	—	3	—	—
Jews	—	2	—	—	—

The Church Schools, together with the 10 government schools conducted on the British and Foreign system altogether taught 3,712 pupils. There were in addition 123 private schools. Only 64 of these sent in returns of pupils, the total amounting to 1,733.

* C.O. 206/92 and 284/73.

APPENDIX III

Imperial and Colonial Administrators

IMPERIAL SECRETARIES OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES

G. H. Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen	December 1834 to April 1835
Charles Grant, Baron Glenelg	April 1835 to February 1839
C. H. Phipps, Marquis of Normanby	February 1839 to September 1839
John Russell, Earl Russell	September 1839 to September 1841
E. G. G. S. Stanley, Earl of Derby	September 1841 to December 1845
W. E. Gladstone	December 1845 to July 1846
H. G. Grey, Earl Grey	July 1846 to February 1852

NEW SOUTH WALES

Heads of Administration

Richard Bourke, Governor	December 1831 to December 1837
Kenneth Snodgrass, Acting Governor	December 1837 to February 1838
George Gipps, Governor	February 1838 to July 1846
C. A. FitzRoy, Governor	August 1846 to January 1855

Colonial Secretaries

Alexander Macleay	January 1826 to January 1837
E. Deas Thomson	January 1837 to June 1856

Judiciary

Francis Forbes	Chief Justice, May 1824 to June 1837
James Dowling	Puisne Judge, March 1828 to July 1837, Chief Justice, July 1837 to September 1844
W. W. Burton	Puisne Judge, December 1832 to July 1844
John Kinchela	acting Puisne Judge, April 1836 to November 1837
J. W. Willis	Puisne Judge, November 1837 to January 1841; resident Judge at Port Phillip January 1841 to June 1843; then amoved by Gipps, and returned to England, but his appointment not terminated until October 1846
Alfred Stephen	acting Puisne Judge May 1839 to March 1841; Puisne Judge March 1841 to October 1844; acting Chief Justice October 1844 to April 1845; thereafter Chief Justice until 1873
William Jeffcott	provisional resident Judge at Port Phillip June 1843 to December 1844
William à Beckett	acting Puisne Judge July 1844 to February 1846; thereafter provisional resident Judge at Port Phillip until October 1846, when appointment confirmed; 1851-7 Chief Justice of Victoria
J. N. Dickinson	Puisne Judge October 1844 until 1861

Roger Therry provisional resident Judge at Port Phillip February 1845 to February 1846; thereafter provisional Puisne Judge at Sydney until October 1846 when appointment confirmed, and remained Puisne Judge until 1859

PORT PHILLIP

Heads of Administration

William Lonsdale Administrator, September 1836 to September 1839
 C. J. La Trobe Superintendent, October 1839 to June 1851
 William Lonsdale Acting Superintendent, October 1846 to January 1847

TASMANIA

Heads of Administration

George Arthur Lieutenant Governor, May 1824 to October 1836
 Kenneth Snodgrass Administrator, October 1836 to January 1837
 John Franklin Lieutenant Governor, January 1837 to August 1843
 J. E. Eardley- Lieutenant Governor, August 1843 to October 1846
 Wilmot
 C. J. La Trobe Administrator, October 1846 to January 1847
 W. T. Denison Lieutenant Governor, January 1847 to January 1855

Colonial Secretaries

John Montagu August 1834 to February 1842
 G. T. W. B. Boyes February 1842 to April 1843
 J. E. Bicheno April 1843 to February 1851

Judiciary

J. L. Pedder Chief Justice, March 1824 until 1854
 Algernon Montagu Puisne Judge, February 1833 to December 1847, when removed by Denison, the action being confirmed July 1849
 Thomas Horne Puisne Judge, January 1848 until 1860

ABBREVIATIONS AND USAGES

A.N.U.	Australian National University.
C.O.	Colonial Office.
<i>H. of C. Papers</i>	<i>Accounts and Papers of the House of Commons.</i> The particular paper is designated by short title, the date it bears, and the volume of the year's <i>Accounts and Papers</i> in which it appears. Any page reference is to the particular paper, not to the volume.
<i>H.R.A.</i>	<i>Historical Records of Australia</i> , series one.
<i>H.T.C.</i>	<i>Hobart Town Courier</i> .
<i>J.R.A.H.S.</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society</i> , Sydney.
L.C.	Legislative Council.
<i>L.C. Papers</i>	<i>Papers of the Legislative Council.</i> The particular paper is designated by short title and the date it bears.
ML	Mitchell Library, Sydney.
<i>S.M.H.</i>	<i>Sydney Herald</i> (until 1842), then <i>Sydney Morning Herald</i> .
<i>V. & P.</i>	<i>Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Council.</i> The term is used in its exact meaning as the minutes of daily proceedings, not as a synonym for <i>Papers of the Legislative Council</i> .

'Tasmania' and 'Hobart' are used, although the appropriate contemporary names were 'Van Diemen's Land' and 'Hobart Town'.

'Catholic' is used for 'Roman Catholic' in chapter 5, but elsewhere in its broader meaning. Polding is designated as 'Bishop' throughout, notwithstanding his elevation to the Archbishopric in 1842.

'Emancipist' and 'ex-convict' are used indiscriminately.

Most newspaper references are to editorials or to items indicated by the text. Where identification might prove difficult, a further guide is given in parentheses following the citation of the newspaper's date.

This work is based on the author's Doctoral thesis, available in the A.N.U. Library. The thesis provides more detailed references.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

¹ See Appendix I.

² See Appendices I and II.

³ For lists of Secretaries of State, heads of local administrations, and Judges, see Appendix III.

I CONSERVATIVE IDEOLOGY

¹ See biographical file in the Tasmanian State Archives; also R. Crooke, *The Convict*, *passim*.

² *Standard*, *Record*, *Southern Queen*, and *Guardian* (Sydney); *Melbourne Church of England Messenger*; *Herald of Tasmania* and another *Guardian* (unseen, published 1837) in Tasmania.

³ See R. A. Giles, *The Constitutional History of the Australian Church*, pp. 237 et seq.

⁴ Letter, 6 February 1838 (W. G. Broughton papers). Unless otherwise stated, Broughton's letters are from the Broughton-Coleridge correspondence in this collection.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 14 October 1839, 17 February 1842.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 6 February 1838.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 3 April 1840.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 17, 14 February 1842, 4 December 1841.

⁹ 18 July 1845.

¹⁰ *Guardian*, vol. I, p. 101.

¹¹ *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania . . . 23rd April, 1846*, p. 31.

¹² Letter, 8 May 1850.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 6 March 1847.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 17 February 1842.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 12 June 1846.

¹⁷ Select Committee on Education, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 183, *L.C. Papers* 28 August 1844; letter, 14 January 1843.

¹⁸ T. H. Braim, *A History of New South Wales . . . to . . . 1844*, vol. II, p. 321.

¹⁹ E. G. Pryce and J. Gregor, *Two Journals of Missionary Tours . . . 1843*, p. 10.

²⁰ Letter, 14 October 1839.

²¹ C. Perry, *A Letter from the Lord Bishop of Melbourne . . .*, p. 21.

²² *Pastoral Address*, p. 3.

²³ *S.M.H.*, 1 July 1843.

²⁴ Letter, 14 January 1843.

²⁵ *Charge*, p. 99.

²⁶ F. A. Marriott, *Is a Penal Colony Reconcilable with God's Constitution of Human Society . . .?*, pp. 6-7.

²⁷ 'Further Correspondence on . . . Convict Discipline and Transportation', *H. of C. Papers* 14 May 1851 (vol. XLV), p. 114.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 30 April 1852 (vol. XLI), p. 104.

³⁰ C.O. 201/358, fol. 435.

³¹ Despatch, 1 March 1838 (C.O. 280/107).

³² N. Nixon, *The Pioneer Bishop in Van Diemen's Land 1843-1863*, pp. 24 et seq.; despatch, 7 February 1846 (C.O. 280/192).

³³ C.O. 201/257, fols. 113 et seq., esp. 161.

³⁴ Committee on Immigration, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 13 August 1841, *passim*.

³⁵ See Committee on the Shooting on Sunday Prevention Bill, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 27 July 1841, *passim*; also the subsequent Act, 5 Vic. No. 6.

³⁶ *H.R.A.*, XXIII. 45; C.O. 201/366, fols. 160 et seq.

³⁷ C.O. 280/160, fols. 404 et seq.; W. A. Townsley, *The Struggle for Self-Government in Tasmania, 1842-1856*, p. 27.

³⁸ Nixon, *Pioneer Bishop*, pp. 34, 48; Crooke, *The Convict*, p. 48.

³⁹ K. E. Fitzpatrick, *Sir John Franklin in Tasmania 1837-1843*, p. 274.

⁴⁰ *The Equal Legal Status of all the Churches in the Australian Colonies*, p. 1.

⁴¹ See Nixon's letters to the Colonial Office during 1847 and the minutes thereon (C.O. 280/222); 'Colonial Church Legislation', *H. of C. Papers* 17 May 1852 (vol. XXXII).

⁴² K. E. Fitzpatrick, 'Mr. Gladstone and the Governor', *Historical Studies*, vol. 1, pp. 31-45; Gladstone Papers MSS. 44,364, fols. 47, 61, 65 and 44,365, fols. 123, 307-9.

⁴³ F. T. Whittington, *William Grant Broughton*, pp. 139 et seq.; V. & P., 7 August 1849.

⁴⁴ G. Goodman, *The Church in Victoria during the Episcopate of the Rt. Rev. Charles Perry*, p. 224; A. G. Austin, *George William Rusden and National Education in Australia 1849-1862*, p. 36.

⁴⁵ Despatch, 4 November 1841 (C.O. 280/134).

⁴⁶ C.O. 201/358, fols. 434 et seq.

⁴⁷ 'The Establishment of Episcopal Sees in Australia', *H. of C. Papers* 25 March 1850 (vol. XXXVII); 'Roman Catholic Bishops (Australia)', *H. of C. Papers* 24 February 1851 (vol. XXXV); both *passim*.

⁴⁸ *Charge*, pp. 92 et seq.; Goodman, *The Church in Victoria*, pp. 116 et seq.

⁴⁹ See *H.R.A.*, XXI. 119; C.O. 201/375, fols. 60 et seq.

⁵⁰ *H.R.A.*, XIX. 739-40.

⁵¹ *H.R.A.*, XXVI. 230 et seq.

⁵² *H.R.A.*, XXVI. 98 et seq., 747-8.

⁵³ Despatch, 22 January 1844 (C.O. 280/167).

⁵⁴ *A Letter on the School Question . . .*, p. 9.

⁵⁵ *A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Australia, May 1844*, p. 24.

⁵⁶ *S.M.H.*, 23 October 1841.

⁵⁷ *Charge*, p. 100.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 102-3.

⁵⁹ F. J. Woodward, *The Doctor's Disciples*, p. 92.

⁶⁰ Despatch, 3 November 1843 (C.O. 280/160).

⁶¹ Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836.

⁶² The following discussion is largely based on the *S.M.H.* between 1835 and 1851.

⁶³ *Heads of the People*, vol. II, p. 92.

⁶⁴ Statham and Forster to Macarthur, 1 November 1844 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2927). Hereafter a MS. so described is thus indicated to be held in the Mitchell Library.

⁶⁵ Detailed references to the *Examiner* and *H.T.C.* have been omitted.

⁶⁶ Vol. I, pp. 46 et seq.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 74 et seq.

⁶⁸ Vol. I, pp. iii, 21.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 35 et seq.; see G.W.R.'s letter to *S.M.H.*, 12 January 1847.

2 CONSERVATIVE POWER

¹ 'Report from the Select Committee on Transportation' (Molesworth Committee), 'Minutes of Evidence', qq. 1663 et seq. *H. of C. Papers* 14 July 1837 (vol. XIX).

² *Colonist*, 14 September 1837.

³ *H.R.A.*, XVIII. 754.

⁴ *People's Advocate*, 22 September 1849.

⁵ *V. & P.*, 17 July 1838.

⁶ H. B. Stoney, *A Residence in Tasmania* . . . , p. 151.

⁷ Macarthur papers (MS. A2973, *passim*).

⁸ *The Generations of Men*, p. 2.

⁹ A. C. Grant, *Early Station Life in Queensland* (MS. A858), p. 4.

¹⁰ *H.T.C.*, 28 June 1848.

¹¹ *E.g. Maitland Mercury*, 18 March 1843, 6 January 1844.

¹² *E.g. Colonial Times*, 28 September 1847.

¹³ *H.T.C.*, 4 June 1841.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 12 September 1846.

¹⁵ *Varieties of Vice-Regal Life*, vol. I, pp. 126-7.

¹⁶ J. West, *The History of Tasmania*, vol. I, p. 235.

¹⁷ Letter to Macarthur, 23 August 1843 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2936).

¹⁸ *S.M.H.*, 12 April 1838.

¹⁹ *Varieties of Vice-Regal Life*, vol. I, p. 58; also pp. 35-6, 43 et seq.

²⁰ *Trade and Travel in the Far East*, p. 195.

²¹ D. W. Rawson, *Factions in New South Wales Politics 1820-1840*, *passim*; W. A. Duncan, 'Notes of a Ten Years' Residence in New South Wales', *Hogg's Weekly Instructor*, vol. V, p. 132.

²² G. Ranken, *Wyndabyne*, p. 52.

²³ Letter, 7 September 1844 (Wentworth papers, MS. A756).

²⁴ *H.R.A.*, XXIV. 127.

²⁵ Letter to Tanner, 2 May 1848 (A. Berry papers, vol. V).

²⁶ *L.C. Papers* 16 June 1835, 'Minutes of Evidence'.

²⁷ *The Brisbane Water Cases*, p. 28n.

²⁸ *S.M.H.*, 31 August, 7 September 1838.

²⁹ *Australian*, 15 June 1839.

³⁰ *Colonist*, 15 October 1839; see *H.R.A.*, XX. 497.

³¹ *H.R.A.*, XVIII. 392 et seq.

³² Letters, C.O. 201/258, 267, and 282.

³³ *New South Wales; its present state and future prospects*, p. 11.

- ³⁴ Ibid., p. 27.
³⁵ Ibid., pp. 133 et seq.
³⁶ *H.R.A.*, xviii. 395.
³⁷ *H.R.A.*, xx. 778-9.
³⁸ *S.M.H.*, 6 February 1841.
³⁹ *V. & P.*, 20 September 1838; *H.R.A.*, xix. 609-10.
⁴⁰ *H.R.A.*, xix. 592 et seq.
⁴¹ *S.M.H.*, 17 July 1840.
⁴² Ibid., 7, 13 July 1840.
⁴³ Ibid., 28 February 1842.
⁴⁴ Ibid., 28 June 1843.
⁴⁵ See letter to Macarthur, 23 August 1843 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2936).
⁴⁶ *S.M.H.*, 9 December 1843.
⁴⁷ Ibid., 10 August 1844.
⁴⁸ *Atlas*, 17 May 1845.
⁴⁹ See Foster's speech, *S.M.H.*, 4 May 1848.
⁵⁰ 'Proposed Alterations in the Constitutions of the Australian Colonies', *H. of C. Papers* 25 May 1849 (vol. xxxv), p. 5.
⁵¹ Ibid., 4 February 1851 (vol. xxxv), p. 29.
⁵² *Atlas*, 28 December 1844.
⁵³ *Weekly Register*, 11 January 1845.
⁵⁴ Letter to Statham and Forster, 9 August 1844 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2927).
⁵⁵ *S.M.H.*, 30 September 1844.
⁵⁶ E. C. Rowland, 'The Life and Times of Henry Dangar', *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxxix, p. 72.
⁵⁷ 4 October 1845.
⁵⁸ *Atlas*, 26 July 1845.
⁵⁹ 'Further Correspondence on . . . Convict Discipline and Transportation', *H. of C. Papers* 31 January 1850 (vol. xlv), pp. 34, 39, 40; *ibid.*, 14 May 1851 (vol. xlv), pp. 172 et seq.
⁶⁰ J. McRae (ed.), *Report on the Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania. Number 3*, p. 38.
⁶¹ *S.M.H.*, 31 May 1844.
⁶² J. Syme, *Nine Years in Van Diemen's Land*, p. 133.
⁶³ *My Home in Tasmania*, vol. 1, p. 27.
⁶⁴ Select Committee on the Crown Land Sales Act, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 5 December 1843.
⁶⁵ Committee on Immigration, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 32, *L.C. Papers* 26 August 1842.
⁶⁶ Letter to Corben, 27 January 1837 (A. Berry papers, vol. v).
⁶⁷ L. F. Fitzhardinge, 'Old Canberra and District', pp. 21 et seq.
⁶⁸ Select Committee on . . . Elective Franchise . . . and on the Representation of the Colony, 'Report' and 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 27 September 1844, *passim*.
⁶⁹ See W. Henty, *On Improvements in Cottage Husbandry*, *passim*.
⁷⁰ 'Plain Directions for the Culture and Curing of Tobacco . . .', J. A. Ferguson, *Bibliography of Australia*, item 4198.
⁷¹ *Physical Description of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land*, pp. 381 et seq.

- ⁷² *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 296-7.
⁷³ *S.M.H.*, 28 December 1843.
⁷⁴ *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 181; xxiv. 156-7, 377-8.
⁷⁵ K. E. Fitzpatrick, *Sir John Franklin in Tasmania 1837-1843*, p. 321.
⁷⁶ See J. M. Ward, *Earl Grey and the Australian Colonies 1846-1857*, pp. 31-2.
⁷⁷ Committee on the Crown Lands Bill, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 5 March 1839.
⁷⁸ 2 Vic. No. 27; see *H.R.A.*, xx. 90 et seq.
⁷⁹ Information from Mrs K. Rand, University of Tasmania.
⁸⁰ C.O. 201/315, fols. 54 et seq.; see *S.M.H.*, 6 February 1841.
⁸¹ Crown Land Sales Act Committee, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 5 December 1843.
⁸² Select Committee on Immigration, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 43, *L.C. Papers* 14 September 1847.
⁸³ Select Committee on the Minimum Upset Price of Land, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 28 September 1847.
⁸⁴ Select Committee on Crown Lands, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 3 October 1849.
⁸⁵ 29 May 1851 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2920).
⁸⁶ Letter to Russell, 3 September 1841 (C.O. 201/315).
⁸⁷ See *H.R.A.*, xix. 640 et seq.
⁸⁸ *V. & P.*, 17 July 1838.
⁸⁹ Letter to Macarthur, 27 October 1846 (MS. A2922).
⁹⁰ *S.M.H.*, 25 December 1841.
⁹¹ J. Macarthur and W. C. Wentworth, *Speeches. . . on the . . . Resumption of Transportation*, p. 32.
⁹² See, e.g., *H.R.A.*, xvii. 540, 600, 653.
⁹³ Committee on Immigration, 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 16 June 1835.
⁹⁴ 4 Vic. No. 23; 9 Vic. No. 27; 11 Vic. No. 9.
⁹⁵ Select Committee on the Master and Servant Act, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 5 September 1845.
⁹⁶ *Ibid.*; *S.M.H.*, 1 October 1845 (L.C. debate).
⁹⁷ Letter to Cunninghame, 12 February 1851 (A. Cunninghame papers, MS. A3180).
⁹⁸ Letter, 29 February 1852 (*ibid.*).
⁹⁹ *L.C. Papers* 1836, pp. 467 et seq.; *H.R.A.*, xviii. 228 et seq.
¹ Letter, 27 May 1837 (C.O. 201/267).
² 7 August 1836, 25 August 1843.
³ See chapter 4.
⁴ Despatch, 15 August 1848, *L.C. Papers* 3 September 1849; see also Despatch, 28 December 1849, *L.C. Papers* 19 August 1850.
⁵ 7 May 1851 (E. Deas Thomson papers, MS. A1531/2).
⁶ Letter to Thomson, 16 June 1851 (*ibid.*).
⁷ Despatch, 7 October 1847 and Despatch, 28 December 1849, *L.C. Papers* 19 August 1850.
⁸ *Varieties of Vice-Regal Life*, vol. 1, pp. 138 et seq.
⁹ Despatch, 28 September 1848, *L.C. Papers* 20 August 1850.
¹⁰ 'Proposed Alterations in the Constitutions of the Australian Colonies', *H. of C. Papers* 4 February 1851 (vol. xxxv), pp. 27 et seq.
¹¹ *H.R.A.*, xxvi. 141.

¹² C. P. Hodgson, *Reminiscences of Australia* . . ., p. 4.

¹³ 14 October 1843 and 2 June 1847 respectively.

3 'THAT GIGANTIC ANOMALY, THE SQUATTING SYSTEM OF NEW SOUTH WALES'

¹ *S.M.H.*, 15 April 1848.

² *Land and Labour in Australia*, p. 14.

³ *The Correspondence of John Cotton* . . ., part II, p. 56.

⁴ *H.R.A.*, xx. 839.

⁵ *S.M.H.*, 28 January 1846.

⁶ H. S. Russell, *The Genesis of Queensland*, p. 387.

⁷ Letter to Lloyd, 5 March 1837 (King papers, MS. Ak8).

⁸ See K. Buckley, 'Gipps and the Graziers of New South Wales, 1841-6', *Historical Studies*, vol. vi, p. 404; *H.R.A.*, xxvi. 689 et seq.

⁹ *Port Phillip Gazette*, 30 July 1842 ('A Settler').

¹⁰ See *S.M.H.*, August 1842; *H.R.A.*, xx. xx et seq., xxiii. 548.

¹¹ *S.M.H.*, 24 August 1842.

¹² *Ibid.*, April 1843.

¹³ Select Committee on Crown Land Grievances, 'Report', *L.C. Papers*, 20 August 1844.

¹⁴ *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 545-6.

¹⁵ *S.M.H.*, 10 April 1844.

¹⁶ *H.R.A.*, xxiv. 219-20.

¹⁷ *S.M.H.*, 10 April 1844.

¹⁸ *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 605-6.

¹⁹ 15 February 1845.

²⁰ *Weekly Register*, 26 July 1845.

²¹ *Reminiscences of Australia* . . ., pp. 91 et seq.

²² *S.M.H.*, 28 January 1846.

²³ Letter of Statham and Forster, 1 November 1844 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2927).

²⁴ *S.M.H.*, 28 July 1848.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 12, 27 August 1847.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 9 July 1847.

²⁷ Mackinnon to Black, 9 September 1848 (N. Black papers).

²⁸ Letter, 12 July 1850 (Tindal letter-book, MS. A2068).

²⁹ *Correspondence*, part III, p. 47.

³⁰ Northern and Western Districts of New South Wales (MS. A176), vol. II, p. 23.

³¹ A. A. C. Le Souef, *Personal Recollections of Early Victoria* (MS. A2762).

³² Letter from Bilston, 18 June 1846 (J. D. Lang papers, MS. A2226).

³³ Journal, 10 March 1840 (N. Black papers).

³⁴ Letter to Gladstone, 21 September 1840 (N. Black papers).

³⁵ K. G. T. Waller, *The Letters of the Leslie Brothers in Australia, 1834-1854*, p. 104.

³⁶ Journal, 25 December 1839 (N. Black papers).

³⁷ Waller, *Leslie Letters*, p. 97.

³⁸ E.g., T. F. Bride (ed.), *Letters from Victorian Pioneers*, pp. 177-8.

³⁹ *Old Melbourne Memories*, pp. 51 et seq.

⁴⁰ See J. Kirby, *Old Times in the Bush of Australia*, pp. 48 et seq.

⁴¹ Select Committee on the Aborigines and Protectorate, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 4 September 1849.

⁴² 30 June 1849.

⁴³ See G. C. Mundy, *Our Antipodes*, pp. 97 et seq.; *H.R.A.*, xxi. 209; chapter 7.

⁴⁴ Cotton, *Correspondence*, part III, p. 9.

⁴⁵ *Weekly Register*, 22 March 1845.

⁴⁶ *S.M.H.*, 18 March 1839 (L.C. debate).

⁴⁷ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 13, *L.C. Papers* 26 August 1842.

⁴⁸ *S.M.H.*, 22 May 1844, amplifying his letter *ibid.*, 23 April 1844.

⁴⁹ Buckley, 'Gipps and the Graziers', *Historical Studies*, vol. VII, pp. 188-9.

⁵⁰ See *H.R.A.*, xxiv. 642.

⁵¹ Buckley, 'Gipps and the Graziers', *Historical Studies*, vol. VII, p. 192.

⁵² *S.M.H.*, 8 May 1848; *H.R.A.* xxvi. 448 et seq.

⁵³ See *Moreton Bay Courier*, 30 September 1848.

⁵⁴ *Argus*, 17 January 1849.

⁵⁵ Letters, 27 June, 29 October 1849 (C.O. 201/424).

⁵⁶ 10 March 1847.

⁵⁷ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', Macarthur's evidence, q. 43, *L.C. Papers* 14 September 1847; *H.R.A.*, xxvi. 141, 426; *S.M.H.*, 1 January 1850.

⁵⁸ D. W. A. Baker, 'The Origins of Robertson's Land Acts', *Historical Studies*, vol. VIII, pp. 172-3.

⁵⁹ Letter of Statham and Forster, 27 January 1846 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2927).

⁶⁰ *Cooksland in North-Eastern Australia*, p. 232.

⁶¹ *S.M.H.*, 7 June 1844; *Atlas*, 8 March 1845 ('Argentarius').

⁶² *Land and Labour in Australia*, pp. 106, 146.

⁶³ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', G. Willis's evidence, q. 5, *L.C. Papers* 14 September 1847.

⁶⁴ *S.M.H.*, 30 April 1844.

⁶⁵ *H.R.A.*, xxiv. 717.

⁶⁶ *H.R.A.*, xxvi. 325, 784 et seq.; *S.M.H.*, 23 August 1848; *Maitland Mercury*, 3 May 1848; C. Macalister, *Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South*, pp. 22, 150 et seq.; G. Hawke, *Diary*.

⁶⁷ S. Mossman and T. Banister, *Australia Visited and Revisited*, p. 177.

⁶⁸ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', Campbell's evidence, q. 11, Hamilton's evidence, q. 14, *L.C. Papers* 13 August 1841.

⁶⁹ Select Committee on the Petition from Distressed Mechanics and Labourers, 'Minutes of Evidence', B. Sutherland's evidence, q. 121, *L.C. Papers* 24 November 1843.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, E. Mullens's evidence, q. 33.

⁷¹ Hodgson, *Reminiscences*, pp. 45-6; Cotton, *Correspondence*, part I, p. 43.

⁷² Select Committee on the Renewal of Transportation, 'Minutes of Evidence', J. Dobie's evidence, q. 13, *L.C. Papers* 31 October 1846.

⁷³ Committee on Immigration, 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 7 August 1838.

⁷⁴ Renewal of Transportation Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 11, *L.C. Papers* 31 October 1846.

⁷⁵ Select Committee on Immigration, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* (New South Wales) 30 September 1845.

⁷⁶ *L.C. Papers* 1837, pp. 581 et seq.; Committee on Immigration, 'Report' and 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 11 July and 25 August 1837.

⁷⁷ *S.M.H.*, 22 June 1837.

⁷⁸ Minimum Upset Price of Land Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', Salt-
ing's evidence, q. 52, *L.C. Papers* 28 September 1847; *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 790 et seq.

⁷⁹ Letter to Cunningham, 4 March 1849 (A. Cunningham papers, MS. A3180).

⁸⁰ For an elaboration of the latter, see chapter 9.

⁸¹ Immigration Committee, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 13 August 1841; see *S.M.H.*, 21 July 1841 (Broughton in *L.C.*).

⁸² *H.R.A.*, xix. 401.

⁸³ *S.M.H.*, 21 July 1841.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 3 November 1847.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 23 June 1847.

⁸⁶ A. P. Martin, *Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe . . .*, vol. 1, p. 349.

⁸⁷ 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 14 September 1847.

⁸⁸ *L.C. Papers* 1838, pp. 583 et seq.; Immigration Committee, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 7 August 1838.

⁸⁹ Black to Gladstone, 5 May 1840 (N. Black papers); Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', J. Malcolm's evidence, q. 26, *L.C. Papers* 30 September 1845.

⁹⁰ *S.M.H.*, 26 September 1846 (Bland in *L.C.*); *ibid.*, 11, 20 January 1847.

⁹¹ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 43, *L.C. Papers* 14 September 1847.

⁹² Letter to Brownrigg, 7 July 1842 (King papers, MS. A1977).

⁹³ E.g. *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 510.

⁹⁴ *H.R.A.*, xxiv. 445 et seq.

⁹⁵ *Weekly Register*, 26 April 1845.

⁹⁶ Vol. 1, p. 361.

⁹⁷ Vol. 1, pp. 33 et seq.

⁹⁸ Quotations respectively from letters, 28 February 1838, 28 September 1839, 22 November 1841, 20 January 1841 (Dowling papers, MS. A486).

⁹⁹ Letter, 19 August 1846 (W. Campbell papers, MS. A3587).

¹ Diary, 15 July 1846 (G. Hobler's diaries, MS. C425).

² H. W. Haygarth, *Recollections of Bush Life in Australia . . .* p. 11.

³ *Reminiscences*, pp. 13-14.

⁴ Journal, 15 March 1840 (N. Black papers).

⁵ Land Grievances Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 13, *L.C. Papers* 20 August 1844.

⁶ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 11 July 1837; Letter to Gladstone, 30 September 1846 (N. Black papers); H. S. Russell, *The Genesis of Queensland*, p. 392.

⁷ *S.M.H.*, 29 November 1848.

4 RADICAL POLITICS: NEW CLAIMS AND CONFLICT

¹ *H.R.A.*, xxiv. 374.

² J. Bostock, *The Dawn of Australian Psychiatry*, pp. 82 et seq.

- ³ Letter to Thomson, 12 April 1851 (E. Deas Thomson papers, MS. A1531).
- ⁴ W. H. Hudspeth, *Hudspeth Memorial Volume: An introduction to the diaries of the Rev. Robert Knopwood and G. T. W. B. Boyes*, p. 112.
- ⁵ Letter to Arthur, 28 March 1838 (G. Arthur papers, MS. A2170).
- ⁶ *H.T.C.*, 20 August 1845.
- ⁷ A. C. V. Melbourne, *Early Constitutional Development in Australia. New South Wales 1788-1856*, p. 285.
- ⁸ *Weekly Register*, 27 July 1844 ('An ex-P.M.').
- ⁹ E. Curr (ed.), *The Petitions of the District of Port Phillip . . .*, p. x.
- ¹⁰ *Chronicle*, 3 March 1842.
- ¹¹ *Speech on the Australian Colonies Bill . . .*, p. 24.
- ¹² See C. R. Darwin, *Journal of Researches . . . during the Voyage of H.M.S. Beagle . . .*, p. 444.
- ¹³ R. B. Ward, *The Australian Legend*, pp. 53, 57.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63; C. Chisholm, *Emigration and Transportation Relatively Considered*, p. 18.
- ¹⁵ *Australian Colonies Bill*, p. 26.
- ¹⁶ J. G. Johnston, *The Truth*, p. 23.
- ¹⁷ See L. A. Meredith, *Notes and Sketches of New South Wales . . .*, pp. 50-1.
- ¹⁸ *Australian*, 11 April 1844.
- ¹⁹ T. McCombie, *Australian Sketches*, p. 107.
- ²⁰ *Sporting Times*, 29 July 1848.
- ²¹ Melbourne, *Constitutional Development*, pp. 247-8; W. Bland, *Letter from the Australian Patriotic Association . . . March, 1839*.
- ²² *S.M.H.*, 29 June 1840.
- ²³ *Letter . . . on the Bill for the Introduction of Municipal Institutions. . .*
- ²⁴ *Letter . . . on the Census Bill. . .*
- ²⁵ *H.R.A.*, XXI. 154-5 The Census Act was 4 Vic. No. 26.
- ²⁶ *H.R.A.*, XXI. 441-2.
- ²⁷ *H.R.A.*, XXI. 510.
- ²⁸ See *Chronicle*, 1 March 1842.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 17 June 1843.
- ³⁰ *S.M.H.*, 27 August 1835.
- ³¹ See Duncan's autobiography (MS. A2877).
- ³² *H.R.A.*, XXII. 376-7.
- ³³ Diary, 9 November 1846 (MS. A2062). Possibly exaggerated.
- ³⁴ *Guardian*, 22 June 1844.
- ³⁵ *S.M.H.*, 10 June 1844; C. H. Bertie, *The Early History of the Sydney Municipal Council . . .*, pp. 44 et seq.
- ³⁶ See *H.R.A.*, XXIV. 83-4.
- ³⁷ Select Committee on the Insecurity of Life and Property, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 23 August 1844.
- ³⁸ The Act was 8 Vic. No. 14.
- ³⁹ Select Committee on the City Corporation, 'Report' and 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 2 August 1849.
- ⁴⁰ Bertie, *Sydney Council*, pp. 38-9.
- ⁴¹ *S.M.H.*, 16, 18 August, 26 September 1849.
- ⁴² *People's Advocate*, 14 April 1849.
- ⁴³ *S.M.H.*, 28 January 1842.

- ⁴⁴ Ibid., 10 September 1849 (L.C. debate).
⁴⁵ *Parramatta Chronicle*, 11 May 1844.
⁴⁶ See A. Gilchrist (ed.), *John Dunmore Lang, Chiefly Autobiographical . . . Documents . . .*, p. 488.
⁴⁷ *H.R.A.*, xxvi. 169.
⁴⁸ *People's Advocate*, 21 July 1849.
⁴⁹ Handbill in J. Martin papers.
⁵⁰ Select Committee on the Qualification of James Martin, Esq., 'Minutes of Evidence', Gannon's evidence, *L.C. Papers* 13 June 1849.
⁵¹ *S.M.H.*, 27 ('A Clergyman'), 26 ('A Native'), March 1849.
⁵² See *People's Advocate*, 14 April 1849; *Bell's Life*, 9 March 1850 (suggested candidature of H. G. Douglass).
⁵³ *Representative*, 18 July 1850.
⁵⁴ *V. & P.*, 12, 16 July 1850.
⁵⁵ Gilchrist, *Lang*, p. 488; *Bell's Life*, 17 August 1850; 'Further Correspondence on . . . Convict Discipline and Transportation', *H. of C. Papers* 31 January 1850 (vol. XLV), pp. 31, 34; *ibid.*, 14 May 1851 (vol. XLV), pp. 169 et seq.
⁵⁶ *Bell's Life*, 7 December (public meeting), 16 November 1850.
⁵⁷ *Empire*, 11 January 1851.
⁵⁸ L. Thomas, *The Development of the Labour Movement in the Sydney District of New South Wales*, pp. 25-6.
⁵⁹ *S.M.H.*, 16 October 1837 ('Sandy Macalpin').
⁶⁰ See J. Ward, *Perils, Pastimes and Pleasures of an Emigrant*, p. 308.
⁶¹ 'Comfort for the Poor', see J. A. Ferguson, *Bibliography of Australia*, item 4487.
⁶² *Sinmonds's Colonial Magazine*, vol. ix, pp. 196-7.
⁶³ J. Hood, *Australia and the East*, p. 146.
⁶⁴ F. K. Crowley, *Working Class Conditions in Australia 1788-1851*, pp. 334 et seq.
⁶⁵ See chapters 7, 8, 9.
⁶⁶ See Crowley, *Working Class Conditions*, p. 476; L. J. Hume, *The Labour Movement in New South Wales and Victoria 1830-1860*, pp. 72-3; *People's Advocate*, 22 June 1850 (correspondence); *S.M.H.*, 2 September 1846 ('Screwdriver').
⁶⁷ *H.R.A.*, xviii. 516 et seq.
⁶⁸ Thomas, *The Development of the Labour Movement*, pp. 58 et seq.; *Australian*, 13 October 1835.
⁶⁹ Duncan's autobiography (MS. A2877).
⁷⁰ *S.M.H.*, 28 September (public meeting), 1 October (L.C. debate) 1840.
⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 8 January, 6 February 1841 (public meetings).
⁷² *Chronicle*, 23 December 1841.
⁷³ *Ibid.*, 7 July 1842 (public meeting); *S.M.H.*, 7 July 1842 (L.C. debate).
⁷⁴ See Thomas, *The Development of the Labour Movement*, pp. 64 et seq.; *S.M.H.*, 11 February 1839, 28 January 1843; *Chronicle*, 28 September 1841.
⁷⁵ *Free Press*, 8 March 1842 (correspondence).
⁷⁶ *Chronicle*, 1 March 1842.
⁷⁷ *Colonial Observer*, 10 May 1843; see *ibid.*, 3 May 1843 (accusation against Cooper), and *Australian*, 12 May 1843 (denial from Macdermott).
⁷⁸ *S.M.H.*, 10 April 1844.

⁷⁹ A. P. Martin, *Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe...*, vol. 1, pp. 216 et seq.; Select Committee on the Privileges of the Council, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 7 December 1844.

⁸⁰ *Atlas*, 11 July 1846.

⁸¹ 'Notes of a Ten Years' Residence in New South Wales', *Hogg's Weekly Instructor*, vol. v, p. 147.

⁸² *H.R.A.*, xxii. 594 et seq.

⁸³ *S.M.H.*, 3, 11 January, 2, 10, 28 February 1843; *Weekly Register*, 12 August, 28 October 1843, 25 May 1844; *Guardian*, 24 August 1844; *V. & P.*, 19 June, 24 July, 15, 21 August, 10 October, 27 November 1844 (presentation of petitions).

⁸⁴ *Guardian*, 16 March 1844.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 20 April 1844.

⁸⁶ *S.M.H.*, 7, 8 February 1844.

⁸⁷ Distressed Mechanics and Labourers Committee, frontispiece, *L.C. Papers* 24 November 1843.

⁸⁸ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', *L.C. Papers* 5 December 1843; see *S.M.H.*, 10 February 1843 ('B.S.').

⁸⁹ 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 19 September 1844.

⁹⁰ *Weekly Register*, 17 August 1844.

⁹¹ *Guardian*, 17 August 1844.

⁹² *S.M.H.*, 26 September 1844 (L.C. debate).

⁹³ City Corporation Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', Hollinshed's evidence, qq. 4 et seq., *L.C. Papers* 2 August 1849.

⁹⁴ See Hume, *The Labour Movement in New South Wales and Victoria*, pp. 149-50.

⁹⁵ *Guardian*, 17 August 1844.

⁹⁶ 2 March 1844.

⁹⁷ See respectively 10, 24 May, 4 October, 10 May, 1 March 1845.

⁹⁸ *H.R.A.*, xxv. 348 et seq.

⁹⁹ H. Parkes, *Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History*, p. 10.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8; *Australian Encyclopaedia*, 'Hall, Edward Smith'.

² *S.M.H.*, 1 August 1848; *Elector*, 27 July 1848.

³ *S.M.H.*, 22 December 1848.

⁴ *People's Advocate*, 10 February 1849.

⁵ See respectively 28, 14 April, 24, 31 March, 6 January, 10 February 1849, 23 March 1850.

⁶ *People's Advocate*, 23 December 1848 and subsequent issues.

⁷ Letter of 8 July 1849 (C.O. 201/424).

⁸ *S.M.H.*, 22 December 1849.

⁹ Gilchrist, *Lang*, pp. 479 et seq.; *Bell's Life*, 29 June 1850 and subsequent issues.

¹⁰ Letter of 4 November 1850 (J. D. Lang papers, MS. A2226).

¹¹ *S.M.H.*, 27, 28 August 1850.

¹² *People's Advocate*, 15 February 1851 and subsequent issues.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 24 May 1851.

¹⁴ *Argus*, 28 September 1850.

¹⁵ *Moreton Bay Courier*, 17 November 1849, 10 August, 9 November, 21 December 1850.

¹⁶ Select Committee on Distressed Laborers, 'Report', and 'Minutes of Evidence', F. L. S. Mereweather's evidence, qq. 8 et seq., *L.C. Papers* 19 September 1844.

¹⁷ *Chronicle*, 19 June 1844 (China migration). *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 212 (Chile); 'Re-Emigration', *L.C. Papers* 5 June 1850.

¹⁸ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', G. F. Johnson's evidence, qq. 45 et seq., *L.C. Papers* 5 December 1843.

¹⁹ Distressed Mechanics and Labourers Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', C. Chisholm's evidence, q. 45, *L.C. Papers* 24 November 1843.

²⁰ See respectively *S.M.H.*, 28 October 1840; *Colonial Observer*, 18 January 1843; *H.R.A.* xxiv. 655-6; *S.M.H.*, 25, 30 May 1848 and 24 August 1850 (Mayor's Ball).

²¹ Bostock, *Dawn of Psychiatry*, pp. 81 et seq.; see *S.M.H.*, 30 June 1843 ('C.R.H.').

²² *Atlas*, 23 March 1845 (report from Singleton); *S.M.H.*, 23 March 1844.

²³ *S.M.H.*, 13 November 1844.

²⁴ See respectively W. T. Denison, *Varieties of Vice-Regal Life*, vol. 1, p. 29; Ross to Pedder, 1838 (?) (G. Arthur papers, MS. A2170); R. M. Hartwell, *The Economic Development of Van Diemen's Land 1820-1850*, pp. 85 et seq.; Crowley, *Working Class Conditions*, pp. 201, 365 et seq., 475.

²⁵ *The History of Tasmania*, vol. 1, p. 157.

²⁶ *Colonial Times*, 4 February 1848; *H.T.C.*, 19 October 1850.

²⁷ *H.T.C.*, 28 April 1847.

²⁸ Hartwell, *Economic Development*, p. 92.

²⁹ *Examiner*, 18 July 1849; see also 20 June and 22 December 1849.

³⁰ *H.T.C.*, 25 September 1850.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 19 October 1850.

³² *Hobart Guardian*, 23 November 1850, 13 September 1851.

³³ 30 December 1847; 13 September 1849.

³⁴ E. M. Miller, *Pressmen and Governors*, pp. 285-6.

³⁵ *Hobart Guardian*, 21 August 1847.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 12 September 1849 ('F.T.F.').

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 30 January 1850 and subsequent issues.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 30 October 1850 ('Address').

³⁹ Miller, *Pressmen and Governors*, p. 285.

⁴⁰ *Hobart Guardian*, 23 October 1850.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 12 February 1851.

⁴² *Colonial Times*, 15 November 1850.

⁴³ G. T. Boyes's diary, 8 July 1850.

5 THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS MEMBERS

¹ *S.M.H.*, 23 November 1842.

² *Chronicle*, 1 January 1845.

³ *Atlas*, 21 December 1844; *Sentinel*, 8 January 1845.

⁴ *A Reply to Judge Burton*, p. 94.

⁵ H. N. Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers in Australia*, vol. 1, p. 288.

⁶ E. M. O'Brien, *Life and Letters of Archpriest John Joseph Therry* . . . , p.

332.

⁷ *Chronicle*, 6 June, 17 March 1840, 16 January 1841.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 22 November 1839.

- ⁹ See Duncan's autobiography (MS. A2877).
¹⁰ Letter to Macarthur, 15 September 1851 (Macarthur papers, MS. A2930).
¹¹ *Weekly Register*, 13 April 1844.
¹² *Ibid.*, 12 August 1843.
¹³ *Chronicle*, 29 November 1843.
¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 9 October 1844.
¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 12 October 1844.
¹⁶ *Sentinel*, 12 March 1846.
¹⁷ A. Gilchrist (ed.), *John Dunmore Lang, Chiefly Autobiographical . . . Documents . . .*, pp. 483-4.
¹⁸ 17 April 1851.
¹⁹ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. II, pp. 170-1.
²⁰ *Irish Exile*, 16 November 1850.
²¹ *Ibid.*, 13 July 1850.
²² *H.R.A.*, xx. 270.
²³ *S.M.H.*, 8 February 1843.
²⁴ *Addresses to the Right Rev. R. W. Willson, D.D.*, pp. 11-12.
²⁵ *Chronicle*, 25 August 1840; *Hobarton Guardian*, 12 June 1847.
²⁶ *The Pastoral Instruction for Lent, 1837 . . .*, p. 4.
²⁷ *H.T.C.*, 4 August, 4 September 1840.
²⁸ Education Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', qq. 29 et seq., *L. C. Papers* 28 August 1844.
²⁹ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. I, p. 411.
³⁰ W. G. Ullathorne, *From Cabin-Boy to Archbishop* (S. Leslie, ed.), p. 158.
³¹ *The Wanderings of the Human Mind . . .*, p. 68.
³² *Colonial Times*, 9 April 1839.
³³ *H.T.C.*, 25 November 1842 (advertisement).
³⁴ J. B. Polding, *A Report Containing the Pastoral Address of the Right Reverend Bishop . . .*, p. 10.
³⁵ J. Kenny, *A History of the Commencement and Progress of Catholicity in Australia up to the year 1840*, p. 94.
³⁶ *Weekly Register*, 27 January 1844.
³⁷ *Ibid.*, 27 July 1844.
³⁸ *S.M.H.*, 8 October 1846.
³⁹ *H.T.C.*, 29 January, 9 March 1841; P. F. Moran, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia*, pp. 252-3; *Dictionary of National Biography*, 'Anstey, Thomas Chisholm'.
⁴⁰ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. II, p. 170; Moran, *History*, pp. 778 et seq.
⁴¹ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. II, p. 184; Moran, *History*, p. 736.
⁴² *Colonial Times*, 17 August, 7 December 1849, 26 February 1850 ('Palaemon').
⁴³ 9 March 1850.
⁴⁴ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. II, pp. 148, 283-4.
⁴⁵ O'Brien, *Therry*, p. 243.
⁴⁶ *Colonial Times*, 14 August, 18 September 1849; *H.T.C.*, 6 October 1849.
⁴⁷ *H.T.C.*, 9 March 1850.
⁴⁸ 11 October 1849 ('A True Catholic').
⁴⁹ 15 March 1850.
⁵⁰ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. I, p. 291.
⁵¹ Moran, *History*, p. 226.

- ⁵² C.O. 201/315, fols. 224 et seq.; see also C.O. 201/292, fol. 468.
⁵³ *Autobiography*, p. 168.
⁵⁴ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. I, pp. 336-7.
⁵⁵ *Chronicle*, 16 September 1841.
⁵⁶ *Colonial Times*, 26 July 1842.
⁵⁷ *The History of Tasmania*, vol. I, p. 260.
⁵⁸ Moran, *History*, p. 236.
⁵⁹ *H.R.A.*, xxvi, 776.
⁶⁰ Moran, *History*, p. 864.
⁶¹ *Cabin-Boy to Archbishop*, p. 168.
⁶² Moran, *History*, p. 717.
⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 430; O. Thorpe, *First Catholic Mission to the Australian Aborigines*, p. 208.
⁶⁴ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. I, p. 306.
⁶⁵ *Chronicle*, 18 March 1841.
⁶⁶ Moran, *History*, p. 731; F. Mackle, *The Footprints of Our Catholic Pioneers*, pp. 30-1.
⁶⁷ *Chronicle*, 14 October 1846; *Weekly Register*, 29 November 1845.
⁶⁸ *Colonial Observer*, 21 December 1841 ('G.U.A.');
- Chronicle*, 28 January 1841.
⁶⁹ *Chronicle*, 11 August 1847, 16 March 1848.
⁷⁰ Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol. I, p. 292; vol. II, pp. 9, 160.

6 PROTESTANTISM

- ¹ *Examiner*, 28 November 1846.
² *Diary*, 30 January 1844 (MS. A2062).
³ *Private Communications Given to John Wroe*, vol. III, p. 563.
⁴ J. Watsford, *Glorious Gospel Triumphs*, p. 28; see J. Colwell, *The Illustrated History of Methodism*, pp. 339 et seq.
⁵ Letter, in N. Turner, *Personal narrative 1793-1846* (MS. A1836), pp. 399-400.
⁶ H. Button, *Flotsam and Jetsam*, p. 59.
⁷ *The Second Report of the Van Diemen's Land Home Missionary and Christian Instruction Society*, p. 9.
⁸ A. L. F., *The History of Samuel Terry . . .*, pp. 10-11.
⁹ *The History of Tasmania*, vol. I, p. 214.
¹⁰ *A History of New South Wales . . . to . . . 1844*, vol. I, p. 169.
¹¹ F. M. Bradshaw, *Scottish Seceders in Victoria*, p. 17.
¹² *Examiner*, 26 August ('Anti-Mammon'), 7 November 1846 (presbytery meeting).
¹³ Letter to Hoole, 16 August 1837 (J. Orton's letter-book, MS. A1719).
¹⁴ C. C. Dugan, *A Century of Tasmanian Methodism 1820-1920*, p. 61.
¹⁵ Meeting of Conference, 15 September 1842 (Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society . . . minutes, MS. A2806).
¹⁶ *Colonial Observer*, 8 August 1844 (statement by J. Garrett).
¹⁷ Report from Hunter River to meeting of 31 March 1845 (Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society . . . minutes, MS. A2806).
¹⁸ Letter from Crook and others, 12 April 1838 (London Missionary Society, Australian correspondence).
¹⁹ W. Woolls, *A Tract for the Times . . .*, p. 19.

- ²⁰ See W. Trollope, *The Roman Catholics of Port Phillip and their Champion* . . . , p. 7.
- ²¹ *History*, vol. 1, p. 216.
- ²² *A Letter from the Rev. John Lillie* . . . , pp. 23 et seq.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, appendix, p. viii.
- ²⁴ See *H.T.C.*, 4, 18 September, 8 December 1847.
- ²⁵ K. E. Fitzpatrick, *Sir John Franklin in Tasmania 1837-1843*, p. 103; G. T. Boyes's diary, June 1843.
- ²⁶ Select Committee on the Census Bill, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 4, *L.C. Papers* (New South Wales) 14 October 1845.
- ²⁷ Letter to Manton, 20 December 1836 (J. Orton's letter-book, MS. A1718).
- ²⁸ *A Letter to the Rev. Henry Tarlton Stiles* . . . , p. 8.
- ²⁹ 26 October 1842.
- ³⁰ J. West, *The Voluntary Support of the Christian Ministry Alone Scriptural and Defensible*, p. 2.
- ³¹ *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, vol. 1, p. 26.
- ³² 18 March 1843.
- ³³ 11 June 1846.
- ³⁴ Letter to *British Banner*, 15 November 1848.
- ³⁵ *Argus*, 13 October 1846 (mock requisition for municipal elections); *Sentinel*, 25 May 1848, 28 October 1847.
- ³⁶ Vol. II, pp. 1 et seq.
- ³⁷ Vol. I, pp. 161 et seq., 181.
- ³⁸ Letter to *British Banner*, 15 November 1848.
- ³⁹ *Colonial Observer*, 13 June 1844; *Examiner*, 18 September 1844.
- ⁴⁰ Letter, 23 February 1852 (J. D. Lang papers, MS. A2226).
- ⁴¹ Vol. I, p. 277.
- ⁴² Address to Portland School of Arts (Laurie papers).
- ⁴³ *Examiner*, 9 September 1843; *H.T.C.*, 24 March 1849.
- ⁴⁴ *A Funeral Sermon* . . . , pp. 12 et seq.
- ⁴⁵ Letter to Allan, 9 August 1844 (J. McGarvie diary, MS. A2062).
- ⁴⁶ *A Question for the Times* . . . , p. 22.
- ⁴⁷ *The True Glory of a Christian Church*, pp. 15-16.
- ⁴⁸ W. Hamilton, *Practical Discourses* . . . , pp. 103 et seq.
- ⁴⁹ *H.T.C.*, 30 August 1844.
- ⁵⁰ *A Sermon* . . . , pp. 18 et seq.; *Lecture upon the Advantages of Science* . . . , p. 17.
- ⁵¹ *Port Phillip Christian Herald*, 6 April 1849.
- ⁵² A. Gilchrist (ed.), *John Dunmore Lang, Chiefly Autobiographical* . . . Documents . . . , p. 242.
- ⁵³ *History*, vol. 1, p. 346.
- ⁵⁴ *Lectures on the Prophecy and the Kingdom of Christ* . . . , p. 11.
- ⁵⁵ *Examiner*, 28 November 1846.
- ⁵⁶ See G. H. Nadel, *Australia's Colonial Culture*, p. 255.
- ⁵⁷ *Pastoral Letter of the Van Diemen's Land Presbytery*, p. 7.
- ⁵⁸ *The Language of Theology Interpreted* . . . , pp. 179, 128.
- ⁵⁹ Nadel, *Australia's Colonial Culture*, p. 236 et passim.
- ⁶⁰ *Examiner*, 7 November 1846 (Lillie's statement); *H.T.C.*, 18 November 1846 and subsequent issues (correspondence with Davies).
- ⁶¹ Vol. I, p. 74.
- ⁶² *Practical Discourses*, pp. 80-1.

7 THE FAITH, THE MIND, AND THE PSYCHE

- ¹ Note to poem 'Have Faith' (C. Harpur, Poems 1847-8, MS. C382).
- ² 'The Perception of the Beautiful . . .', p. 7.
- ³ See *Colonial Literary Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 371-2, 388-9.
- ⁴ H. Dunn and J. T. Crossley (eds.), *Daily Lesson Book for the Use of Schools and Families*. No. III, p. 19.
- ⁵ H.T.C., 21 August 1835.
- ⁶ *Two Speeches Delivered by William Charles Wentworth, Esq.*, p. 22.
- ⁷ Vol. II, pp. 81-2; see also pp. 97-8.
- ⁸ Vol. II, p. 207.
- ⁹ S.M.H., 8 February 1849.
- ¹⁰ 23 June 1837.
- ¹¹ A. P. Martin, *Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe . . .*, vol. I, pp. 323-4.
- ¹² *Knowledge as the Means of Correcting Prejudice . . .*, p. 30.
- ¹³ Franchise Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 12, L.C. Papers (New South Wales) 27 September 1844.
- ¹⁴ 'Catholicus', *An Original Essay on Popular Education . . .*, p. 12.
- ¹⁵ *Examiner*, 24 April 1850.
- ¹⁶ 'Petition . . . on the New College', L.C. Papers 4 September 1840.
- ¹⁷ *An Octogenarian's Reminiscences*, p. 247.
- ¹⁸ H.T.C., 30 December 1842.
- ¹⁹ See his evidence to committee enquiring into educational system, 1845, C.O. 280/182.
- ²⁰ J. D. Loch, *An Account of the Introduction and Effects of the System of General Religious Education Established in Van Diemen's Land in 1839*, p. 66.
- ²¹ Preface to collected poems (C. Harpur, Poems 1847-8, MS. C382); letter to Parkes, 21 March 1844 (MS. A1131); *Weekly Register*, 26 July 1845 (article).
- ²² 7 September 1841 and 3 May 1845 respectively.
- ²³ *The Fine Arts*, pp. 3-4.
- ²⁴ Vol. II, pp. 273-4.
- ²⁵ *The Australian Manual of Horticulture*, p. 1.
- ²⁶ Letters to Lang, 3 March, 31 July 1850 (J. D. Lang papers, MS. A2226).
- ²⁷ *Lecture upon the Advantages of Science*, p. 7.
- ²⁸ Vol. I, p. 5.
- ²⁹ *Colonial Observer*, 23 December 1841.
- ³⁰ *A Lecture on the Mechanical Agency of the Press . . .*, p. 30.
- ³¹ Vol. I, p. 370.
- ³² 20 June 1846.
- ³³ Vol. I, p. 16.
- ³⁴ *Illustrated Australian Magazine*, vol. II, p. 380.
- ³⁵ 7 December 1844.
- ³⁶ See *Tasmanian & Review*, 26 January 1838.
- ³⁷ *Arden's Sydney Magazine*, vol. I, pp. 65 et seq.; *New South Wales Magazine*, vol. I, pp. 51 et seq.
- ³⁸ *Geography*, p. 17.
- ³⁹ Vol. I, p. 4.

- ⁴⁰ See Nadel, *Australia's Colonial Culture*, pp. 139 et seq.
⁴¹ *Exposition of Various Admitted Modern Theories*, p. 80n.
⁴² See C.O. 201/392, fols. 3 et seq.
⁴³ J. Bostock, *The Dawn of Australian Psychiatry*, p. 178.
⁴⁴ J.B.H., *A Catechism of Mesmerism* . . .; 'The Mysteries of Mesmeric or Magnetic Influence' . . ., J. A. Ferguson, *Bibliography of Australia*, item 5415a
⁴⁵ *Argus*, 31 July, 1 August 1850.
⁴⁶ *S.M.H.*, 4, 18, 21 November 1846.

8 THE FAITH, THE WILL, AND THE SOUL

- ¹ *Standard of Tasmania*, 23 October 1851.
² Letter, 15 December 1834 (J. Saunders scrapbook, MS. B1106).
³ *H.R.A.*, xxi. 510.
⁴ 3 November 1841.
⁵ *Colonist*, 3 September 1835; *Sydney Illustrated*, p. 84.
⁶ Essay dated 10 February 1848 (C. Harpur, Poems 1847-8, MS. C382).
⁷ *S.M.H.*, 9 May 1837.
⁸ R. S. Nichols, *Lecture on the Progress of Teetotalism* . . ., p. 8.
⁹ *Australian Temperance Magazine*, vol. iii, pp. 177 et seq.
¹⁰ Lady Franklin's Diary in New South Wales.
¹¹ *Cold Water Army*, p. 8.
¹² *Van Diemen's Land Monthly Magazine*, vol. i, pp. 65 et seq.
¹³ *Australian Temperance Magazine*, vol. ii, p. 129.
¹⁴ *Half-an-Hour's Reading*, p. 3; *Australian Temperance Magazine*, vol. ii, p. 131.
¹⁵ 8 December 1841.
¹⁶ *S.M.H.*, 6 September 1839.
¹⁷ *Sun*, 20 May 1843.
¹⁸ *Tasmanian Magazine and Masonic Register*, vol. i, p. 43.
¹⁹ *Cold Water Army*, p. 5.
²⁰ *Temperance Advocate*, 11 August 1841.
²¹ *Chronicle*, 20 July 1841.
²² *Tasmanian & Review*, 2 January 1835.
²³ *True Colonist*, 7 June 1839.
²⁴ Vol. i, pp. 39-40.
²⁵ 27, 30 July 1838.
²⁶ *Exposition of Various Admitted Modern Theories*, pp. 99, 80n., 124.
²⁷ *H.T.C.*, 27 June, 11 August 1849, 30 October 1850; H. Paul, *The Life of Froude*, p. 50.
²⁸ Letter, 18 January 1850 (T. Arnold papers).
²⁹ *Tasmanian & Review*, 5, 12 February, 9 September 1836, 26 May 1837.
³⁰ *Colonial Times*, 23 April 1839.
³¹ 17, 24 January 1846, 8 May 1847.
³² 10, 17 May, 8 November 1845.
³³ *Tasmanian & Review*, 2 September, 28 October, 18 November 1836.
 Broughton's initials were W. G.
³⁴ 26 April 1845.
³⁵ *S.M.H.*, 11 September 1846; *Atlas*, 26 September 1846; see chapter 1.

- ³⁶ P. F. Moran, *History of the Catholic Church in Australia*, p. 433; M. Kiddle, *Caroline Chisholm*, p. 16.
- ³⁷ Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (W. G. Broughton papers).
- ³⁸ 8 April 1848.
- ³⁹ 6 May 1848 ('Look Ahead').
- ⁴⁰ *Tasmanian & Review*, 13 April 1838.
- ⁴¹ 31 October 1836.
- ⁴² *The Natural and Spiritual Mind Considered in relation to Rational Education and Religious Instruction*, p. iv.
- ⁴³ *Two Speeches Delivered by William Charles Wentworth, Esq.*, p. 19.
- ⁴⁴ *Atlas*, 29 May 1847.
- ⁴⁵ Vol. II, p. 75.
- ⁴⁶ J. Bonwick and T. Turner, *A Letter to Parents upon the Education of their Children*, p. 3.
- ⁴⁷ *Examiner*, 17 June 1843.
- ⁴⁸ *A Converted Atheist's Testimony to the Truth of Christianity*, p. 86.
- ⁴⁹ Enclosures to and minutes on despatch of 12 December 1846 (C.O. 280/198).
- ⁵⁰ *Temperance Advocate*, 3 February 1841.
- ⁵¹ *Melbourne Presbyterian Magazine*, vol. 1, pp. 109-10.
- ⁵² Statement in Tasmanian Total Abstinence Agency papers (MS. A585).
- ⁵³ *Argus*, 10 October 1848.
- ⁵⁴ *Poems*, p. 235.
- ⁵⁵ *Teetotal Advocate*, 3 April 1843 and subsequent issues.
- ⁵⁶ *Temperance Banner*, 8 August 1850.
- ⁵⁷ *Australian Temperance Magazine*, vol. 1, pp. 177 et seq.
- ⁵⁸ *Religious Objections to Teetotal Societies Considered . . .*, p. 9.

9 THE IMPACT OF THE FAITH ON POPULAR AND PUBLIC LIFE

- ¹ T. H. Forster, *Account of a Voyage in a Convict Ship*, p. 22; H. P. Fry, *A System of Penal Discipline . . .*, p. 205.
- ² *Australasia and Prison Discipline*, p. 240.
- ³ C.O. 280/182, fol. 322.
- ⁴ *George William Rusden and National Education in Australia 1849-1862*, p. 60.
- ⁵ Tompson to National Board of Education, 19 September 1849 (National Board Correspondence).
- ⁶ *S.M.H.*, 13 August 1849.
- ⁷ E. Sweetman, *The Educational Activities in Victoria of the Rt. Hon. H. C. E. Childers*, pp. 23 et seq.
- ⁸ See, e.g., R. N. Fogarty, *Catholic Education in Australia 1806-1950*, pp. 107 et seq.
- ⁹ L. F. Fitzhardinge, 'Old Canberra and District', pp. 26-7.
- ¹⁰ *Australian*, 14 August 1843; *S.M.H.*, 15 August 1843; *Examiner*, 19 August 1843.
- ¹¹ Holloway to Colonial Office (C.O. 201/424, fols. 429-30; C.O. 201/437, fol. 395).
- ¹² *Ten Years in Australia*, p. 44.
- ¹³ *Statistics of Van Diemen's Land, for 1838-1841*, p. ix.
- ¹⁴ G. H. Nadel, *Australia's Colonial Culture*, p. 242.

- ¹⁵ H.T.C., 13 June 1849.
- ¹⁶ J. B. Clutterbuck, *Port Phillip in 1849*, p. 71; Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, p. 45.
- ¹⁷ D. C. Griffiths (ed.), *Documents on the Establishment of Education in New South Wales, 1789-1880*, pp. 199-200 (the narrator wrongly speaks of 'William' Hipkiss).
- ¹⁸ Duncan's autobiography (MS. A2877) and his letter to *Moreton Bay Courier*, 13 October 1849.
- ¹⁹ *Teetotaler*, 31 August 1842.
- ²⁰ *Temperance Banner*, 26 September 1850.
- ²¹ *Experiences of a Convict* . . . , p. 98.
- ²² 'Further Correspondence on . . . Convict Discipline and Transportation', *H. of C. Papers* 16 February 1847 (vol. XLVIII), p. 191.
- ²³ 3 December 1842.
- ²⁴ J. Backhouse & C. Tylor, *The Life and Labours of George Washington Walker* . . . , p. 521.
- ²⁵ Select Committee on Police, 'Minutes of Evidence', J. Wearin's evidence, q. 54, *L.C. Papers* 14 September 1847; J. C. Byrne, *Twelve Years' Wanderings in the British Colonies*, vol. 1, p. 136.
- ²⁶ Insecurity of Life and Property Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 35, *L.C. Papers* 23 August 1844.
- ²⁷ Board of Inquiry into the Causes of Decline in the Fees of the Public Departments, 'Second Report', *L.C. Papers* 6 August 1849, p. 6.
- ²⁸ *An Octogenarian's Reminiscences*, p. 170.
- ²⁹ 2 Vic. No. 18, 2 Vic. No. 24, 3 Vic. No. 9, 3 Vic. No. 13.
- ³⁰ 4 Vic. No. 11, 4 Vic. No. 16, 5 Vic. No. 16.
- ³¹ 9 Vic. No. 20, 9 Vic. No. 26, 11 Vic. No. 7; see *H.R.A.*, xxiii. 296.
- ³² See J. Bostock, *The Dawn of Australian Psychiatry*, pp. 38 et seq.
- ³³ *Atlas*, 7 February 1846 (correspondence).
- ³⁴ W. S. Campbell, 'The Parramatta River and its Vicinity', *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. v, p. 257.
- ³⁵ See e.g. *Hobart Town Advertiser*, 11 December 1849 (Melbourne mayoral election).
- ³⁶ D. Peyser, 'History of Welfare Work in Sydney', *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxv, pp. 89-128, 169-212.
- ³⁷ J. Hood, *Australia and the East*, p. 350.
- ³⁸ *S.M.H.*, 3 April 1845; *Report . . . 30th of June, 1839*, p. 13.
- ³⁹ *The Hobart Town General Dispensary and Humane Society*, p. 3.
- ⁴⁰ *Australian Mutual Provident Society*, p. 8.
- ⁴¹ *S.M.H.*, 24 January 1849 (public meeting).
- ⁴² *Tasmanian Weekly Dispatch*, 20 November 1840 (advertisement).
- ⁴³ Committee on Immigration, 'Minutes of Evidence', G. Miller's evidence, *L.C. Papers* 2 September 1840.
- ⁴⁴ Backhouse & Tylor, *Walker*, p. 520.
- ⁴⁵ *Colonial Observer*, 3 May 1843.
- ⁴⁶ 12 May 1843.
- ⁴⁷ Immigration Committee, 'Minutes of Evidence', W. Jacques's evidence, *L.C. Papers* 2 September 1840.
- ⁴⁸ *H.R.A.*, xxi. 510.
- ⁴⁹ D. Burn, *Vindication of Van Diemen's Land*, p. 39; W. R. Allison, *Remarks on the Transportation System*, p. 7.

- ⁵⁰ *Colonist*, 3 October 1840; M. T. Vidal, *Tales for the Bush*, p. 63.
- ⁵¹ 5 July 1847.
- ⁵² *S.M.H.*, 1 September 1842.
- ⁵³ Select Committee on the Division of the Legal Profession Abolition Bill, 'Report', *L.C. Papers* 30 October 1846 and 23 September 1847.
- ⁵⁴ *Emigration* . . ., p. 9.
- ⁵⁵ *England's Exiles*, p. 5.
- ⁵⁶ *A System of Penal Discipline* . . ., p. x.
- ⁵⁷ Committee on the Proposed Gaol at Darlinghurst, 'Report' and 'Minutes of Evidence', M. W. Lewis's evidence, *L.C. Papers* 26 August 1836.
- ⁵⁸ *Atlas*, 2 December 1848.
- ⁵⁹ *The History of Tasmania*, vol. 1, p. 276.
- ⁶⁰ *Tasmanian & Review*, 25 March 1836.
- ⁶¹ J. Smith, *The Moral and Pecuniary Evils which the Free Colonists of Van Diemen's Land are Suffering* . . ., p. 12.
- ⁶² 'Further Correspondence on . . . Convict Discipline and Transportation', *H. of C. Papers* 14 August 1850 (vol. XLV), p. 175.
- ⁶³ *Examiner*, 26 June 1847 (Supplement).
- ⁶⁴ 'Further Correspondence on . . . Convict Discipline and Transportation', *H. of C. Papers* 30 April 1852 (vol. XLI), p. 8.
- ⁶⁵ C. W. Salier, 'The Life and Writings of Charles Harpur', *J.R.A.H.S.* vol. XXXII, p. 93.
- ⁶⁶ *Examiner*, 5 May 1847.
- ⁶⁷ West, *History*, vol. 1, pp. 314-15; J. McRae (ed.), *Report on the Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania*, Number 2, p. 16.
- ⁶⁸ *Examiner*, 12 April 1847.
- ⁶⁹ Hall to Colonial Office (C.O. 201/424 and C.O. 201/437).
- ⁷⁰ Vol. 1, p. 68.
- ⁷¹ Vol. 1, pp. 611 et seq.
- ⁷² Vol. 1, pp. 9 et seq.
- ⁷³ *Recollections of Bush Life in Australia* . . ., p. 152.
- ⁷⁴ W. K. Hancock, *Australia*, p. 140.
- ⁷⁵ Committee on the Savings' Bank Act, 'Minutes of Evidence', q. 5, *L.C. Papers* 27 July 1841.
- ⁷⁶ *History*, vol. II, p. 347.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Sections I and II include pre-1851 items only if the footnotes or text refer to them directly. J. A. Ferguson's *Bibliography of Australia* and the *Union List of Newspapers in Australian Libraries—Part II: Newspapers Published in Australia* (Canberra 1960) obviate any fuller listing. Locations are given for pre-1851 items omitted from these guides. Section II gives the date of commencement of each periodical, the date of closure if within the period, and the greatest frequency of publication within the period. Whether the place of publication is or is not included in the title proper depends on usage and convenience.

I: ARTICLES, BOOKS, AND PAMPHLETS

- A.L.F. *The History of Samuel Terry*. . . . London 1838.
Addresses to the Right Rev. R. W. Willson, D.D. Hobart 1846.
 'A Friend to Truth and Peace.' *A Letter to the Rev. Tarlton Stiles*. . . . Sydney 1840.
 Allen, G. W. D. (ed.) *Early Georgian*. Sydney 1958. The diary of George Allen.
 Allison, W. R. *Remarks on the Transportation System*. Launceston 1847.
 Arden, G. *A Lecture on the Mechanical Agency of the Press*. . . . Melbourne 1840.
 Atkins, T. *Reminiscences*. . . . Malvern (England) 1869.
 Austin, A. G. 'The Bush Boarding School in the Port Phillip District.' *Journal of Education*, Melbourne, vol. III, pp. 106-14 (1956).
 Austin, A. G. *George William Rusden and National Education in Australia 1849-1862*. Melbourne 1958.
 Austin, A. G. *Australian Education 1788-1900*. Melbourne 1961.
Australian Mutual Provident Society. Sydney 1849. Available at M.L.
 Backhouse, J., & Tylor, C. *The Life and Labours of George Washington Walker*. . . . London 1862.
 Baker, D. W. A. 'The Origins of Robertson's Land Acts.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. VIII, pp. 166-83 (1958).
 Barff, H. E. *A Short Historical Account of the University of Sydney*. Sydney 1902.
 Barrett, W. R., *History of the Church of England in Tasmania*. Hobart 1942.
 Barrie, D. M. *The Australian Bloodhorse*. Sydney 1956.
 Barry, J. V. W. *Alexander Maconochie of Norfolk Island*. Melbourne 1958.
 Bassett, F. M. *The Hentys*. London 1954.
 Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *see Report*. . . .
 Bennett, S. *The History of Australian Discovery and Colonisation*. Sydney 1867.
 Berry, A. *Reminiscences of Alexander Berry* (A. Hay, ed.). Sydney 1912.
 Bertie, C. H. *The Early History of the Sydney Municipal Council*. . . . Sydney 1911.
 Billis, R. V., & Kenyon, A. S. *Pastures New*. Melbourne 1930.

- Birt, H. N. *Benedictine Pioneers in Australia*. 2 vols. London 1911.
- Blair, D. 'Sydney in 1850.' *Centennial Magazine*, Sydney, vol. 1, *passim* (1888).
- Bland, W. *Letter from the Australian Patriotic Association . . . March, 1839*. Sydney 1840.
- Bland, W. *Letter . . . on the Bill for the Introduction of Municipal Institutions*. . . . Sydney 1840.
- Bland, W. *Letter . . . on the Census Bill*. . . . Sydney 1840.
- Bland, W. *Letter from the Australian Patriotic Association . . . February, 1841*. Sydney 1841.
- Boldrewood, Rolf, *see* Browne, T. A.
- Bonwick, J. *Geography for the Use of Australian Youth*. Hobart 1845.
- Bonwick, J. *An Octogenarian's Reminiscences*. London 1902.
- Bonwick, J., & Turner, T. *A Letter to Parents upon the Education of their Children*. London 1840.
- Border, R. *Church and State in Australia 1788-1872*. London 1962.
- Bostock, J. *The Dawn of Australian Psychiatry*. Brisbane 1951.
- Bowen, G. M. C. *The Language of Theology Interpreted*. . . . Sydney 1836.
- Boyd, H. V. *Letters on Education*. Sydney 1848.
- Bradshaw, F. M. *Scottish Seceders in Victoria*. Melbourne 1947.
- Braim, T. H. *A History of New South Wales . . . to . . . 1844*. 2 vols. London 1846.
- Bride, T. F. (ed.) *Letters from Victorian Pioneers*. Melbourne 1898.
- Broughton, W. G. *A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Australia, May 1844*. Sydney 1844.
- Brown, P. L. (ed.) *Clyde Company Papers*. 4 vols. Oxford 1941-59. These volumes cover the period 1821-50.
- Browne, T. A. [Rolf Boldrewood]. *Old Melbourne Memories*. Melbourne 1884.
- Browning, C. A. *England's Exiles*. London 1842.
- Buckley, K. 'Gipps and the Graziers of New South Wales, 1841-6.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. vi, pp. 396-412 (1955) and vol. vii, pp. 178-93 (1956).
- Bunce, D. *The Australian Manual of Horticulture*. Melbourne 1850.
- Burn, D. *Vindication of Van Diemen's Land*. London 1840.
- Butlin, S. J. *Foundations of the Australian Monetary System 1788-1851*. Melbourne 1953. Includes an excellent chapter on Savings Banks.
- Button, H. *Flotsam and Jetsam*. Launceston 1909.
- Byrne, J. C. *Twelve Years' Wanderings in the British Colonies*. 2 vols. London 1848.
- Campbell, W. S. 'The Parramatta River and its Vicinity, 1848-1861.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. v, pp. 249-82 (1919).
- 'Catholicus.' *An Original Essay on Popular Education*. . . . Sydney 1848.
- Chisholm, C. *Emigration and Transportation Relatively Considered*. London 1847.
- Claridge, R. T. *Hydropony*. Launceston 1846. A précis of a British work, published in 1842.
- Clifford, W. *An Address to Sir John Lewes Pedder*. . . . Launceston 1843.
- Clutterbuck, J. B. *Port Phillip in 1849*. London 1850.
- Colwell, J. *The Illustrated History of Methodism*. Sydney 1904.
- Coppinger, W. *The Principles of Roman Catholics*. Sydney 1825, Hobart 1840.

- Cotton, J. *The Correspondence of John Cotton* . . . (G. Mackaness, ed.). 3 parts. Sydney 1953.
- Crooke, R. *The Convict*. Hobart 1958. The author was a convict chaplain in Tasmania.
- Cullen, J. H. *The Catholic Church in Tasmania*. Launceston n.d.
- Cullen, J. H. *The Australian Daughters of Mary Aikenhead*. Sydney 1938.
- Cullen, J. H. 'Bishop Willson.' *Australasian Catholic Record*, Sydney, new series, vols. xxvi-xxxi, *passim* (1949-54). The eighteen articles amount to a full biography.
- Curr, E. (ed.) *The Petitions of the District of Port Phillip*. . . . Melbourne 1844.
- Curr, E. M. *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria* . . . 1841-1851. Melbourne 1883.
- Curr, J. *Railway Locomotion, and Steam Navigation*. London 1847.
- Darwin, C. R. *Journal of Researches* . . . during the Voyage of H.M.S. *Beagle*. . . . London 1845. First published 1839.
- Davidson, G. F. *Trade and Travel in the Far East*. London 1846.
- Davis, J. *The Wroeites' Faith*. Sydney 1850.
- Davis, J. *Mormonism*. Sydney 1857.
- Denison, W. T. *Varieties of Vice-Regal Life*. 2 vols. London 1870.
- Donnison, J. *The Brisbane Water Cases*. Sydney 1838.
- Dugan, C. C. *A Century of Tasmanian Methodism 1820-1920*. Hobart n.d.
- Duncan, W. A. *An Appeal from the Unjust Decision of the Very Rev. Vicar General Murphy to His Grace the Archbishop of Sydney*. Sydney 1843.
- Duncan, W. A. *On Self-Supporting Agricultural Working Unions*. . . . Sydney 1844.
- Duncan, W. A. *A Practical Treatise on the Culture of the Olive Tree*. . . . Sydney 1844.
- Duncan, W. A. 'Notes of a Ten Years' Residence in New South Wales.' *Hogg's Weekly Instructor*, Edinburgh, vol. v, pp. 129-33, 147-50 (1847). (ML)
- Duncan, W. A. *Lecture on National Education*. Brisbane 1850.
- Dunlop, N. J. 'Dr. William Bland.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xi, pp. 321-50 (1925).
- Dunn, H., & Crossley, J. T. *Daily Lesson Book for the Use of Schools and Families*. No. III. Hobart 1849.
- Eccleston, J. *Address by James Ecclestone, [sic] Esq., B.A.* Hobart 1849.
- Edwards, W. *Mesmerism: Its practice and phenomena*. Melbourne 1850.
- Equal Legal Status of All the Churches in the Australian Colonies, The*. Hobart 1851.
- Ewing, R. K. *A Question for the Times*. . . . Launceston 1851.
- Ewing, T. J. *Statistics of Van Diemen's Land, for 1838-1841*. Hobart 1843.
- Fairfax, J. F. *The Story of John Fairfax*. Sydney 1941.
- Fenton, J. *A History of Tasmania*. . . . Hobart 1884.
- Fenton, J. *The Life and Work of the Reverend Charles Price*. . . . Melbourne 1886.
- Ferguson, J. A. *Bibliography of Australia*. 4 vols. Sydney 1941-55. This invaluable work covers the period 1784-1850.
- Finn, E. ['Garryowen']. *Chronicles of Early Melbourne*. 2 vols. Melbourne 1880. Pagination continuous.

- Fitzhardinge, L. F. 'Old Canberra and District.' Pp. 14-33 in H. L. White (ed.), *Canberra: A nation's capital*. Sydney 1954.
- Fitzpatrick, B. C. *The British Empire in Australia: An economic history 1834-1939*. Melbourne 1941.
- Fitzpatrick, K. E. 'Mr. Gladstone and the Governor.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. 1, pp. 31-45 (1940). Concerns Eardley-Wilmot's recall.
- Fitzpatrick, K. E. *Sir John Franklin in Tasmania 1837-1843*. Melbourne 1949.
- Fogarty, R. N. *Catholic Education in Australia 1806-1950*. 2 vols. Melbourne 1959. Pagination continuous.
- Forster, T. H. *Account of a Voyage in a Convict Ship*. London 1850.
- Fry, H. P. *A System of Penal Discipline*. . . . London 1850.
- 'Garryowen', see Finn, E.
- Gilchrist, A. (ed.) *John Dunmore Lang, Chiefly Autobiographical . . . Documents*. . . . 2 vols. Sydney 1951. Pagination continuous.
- Giles, R. A. *The Constitutional History of the Australian Church*. London 1929. Concerns the Church of England in Australia.
- Goodman, G. *The Church in Victoria during the Episcopate of the Rt. Rev. Charles Perry*. London 1892.
- Graff, E. *A Discourse upon Nonconformity to the World*. Hobart 1850.
- Green, F. C. 'Heroes in the Fight for Responsible Government.' *Papers and Proceedings of the Tasmanian Historical Research Association*, Hobart, vol. vi, pp. 17-23 (1957).
- Grey, H. G. *The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*. 2 vols. London 1853.
- Griffiths, D. C. (ed.) *Documents on the Establishment of Education in New South Wales, 1789-1880*. Melbourne 1957.
- Gross, A. *Charles Joseph La Trobe*. . . . Melbourne 1956.
- Hamilton, W. *Practical Discourses*. . . . Sydney 1843.
- Hancock, W. K. *Australia*. London 1930.
- Harpur, C. *Poems*. Melbourne 1886.
- Harris, A. ['An Emigrant Mechanic']. *Settlers and Convicts*. London 1847.
- Harris, A. *The Emigrant Family*. London 1849.
- Harris, A. *A Guide to Port Stephens*. . . . London 1849.
- Harris, A. *A Converted Atheist's Testimony to the Truth of Christianity*. London 1852. First published 1848.
- Hartwell, R. M. *The Economic Development of Van Diemen's Land 1820-1850*. Melbourne 1954.
- Haygarth, H. W. *Recollections of Bush Life in Australia*. . . . London 1848.
- Henty, W. *On Improvements in Cottage Husbandry*. Launceston 1849.
- Heyer, J. *The Presbyterian Pioneers of Van Diemen's Land*. Hobart 1935.
- Hobart Town General Dispensary and Humane Society*. Hobart 1847.
- Hodgson, C. P. *Reminiscences of Australia*. . . . London 1846.
- Houison, J. K. S. 'John and Gregory Blaxland.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxii, pp. 1-41 (1936).
- Hood, J. *Australia and the East*. London 1843.
- Hudspeth, W. H. *Hudspeth Memorial Volume: An introduction to the diaries of the Rev. Robert Knopwood and G. T. W. B. Boyes*. Hobart 1954.
- Hutchins, W. *A Letter on the School Question*. . . . Hobart 1839.
- Huxley, T. H. *T. H. Huxley's Diary of the Voyage of H.M.S. Rattlesnake* (J. Huxley, ed.). London 1935. Includes extracts from the diary of the future Mrs Huxley while resident in Sydney 1849-50.

- Inglis, K. S. *Hospital and Community: A history of the Royal Melbourne Hospital*. Melbourne 1958.
- Inglis, K. S. 'Catholic Historiography in Australia.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. viii, pp. 233-52 (1958).
- Irby, E., & L. *Memoirs of Edward and Leonard Irby*. Sydney 1908.
- J.H.B. *A Catechism of Mesmerism*. Melbourne 1850.
- J.S. *The Moral and Pecuniary Evils which the Free Colonists of Van Diemen's Land are Suffering*. . . . London 1846. For evidence of authorship and publication date see C.O. 280/202, fol. 85.
- Jarrett, W. *Farewell Discourse*. Sydney 1838.
- Jervis, J. 'The Hunter Valley.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxxix, pp. 97-150, 191-201 (1953).
- Johnston, J. G. *The Truth*. Edinburgh 1839. Emigrant letters.
- Jose, A. 'John Tawell.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xviii, pp. 31-43 (1932).
- Kelsh, T. (ed.) 'Personal Recollections of the Right Reverend Robert William Willson, D.D. . . . Hobart 1892.
- Kenny, J. *A History of the Commencement and Progress of Catholicity in Australia up to the Year 1840*. Sydney 1886.
- Kentish, N. L. *Essay on Capital Punishment*. . . . Hobart 1842.
- Kiddle, M. *Caroline Chisholm*. Melbourne 1950.
- Kiddle, M. *Men of Yesterday: A social history of the western district of Victoria 1834-1890*. Melbourne 1961.
- Kiernan, T. J. *The Irish Exiles in Australia*. Melbourne 1954.
- King, H. 'Some Aspects of Police Administration in New South Wales, 1825-1851.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xlii, pp. 205-30 (1956).
- Kirby, J. *Old Times in the Bush of Australia*. Ballarat 1895.
- 'A Labouring Mechanic.' *The Touchstone*. Sydney 1850.
- Lang, G. S. *Land and Labour in Australia*. Melbourne 1845.
- Lang, J. D. *The True Glory of a Christian Church*. Sydney 1835.
- Lang, J. D. *Pastoral Address*. Sydney 1844.
- Lang, J. D. *Cooksland in North-Eastern Australia*. London 1847.
- Lang, J. D. *Popery in Australia*. . . . Edinburgh 1847.
- Lang, J. D. *Repeal or Revolution: or, a glimpse of the Irish future*. London 1848.
- Lang, J. D. Letter to the *British Banner*, London, 15 November 1848. Seen in roneoed copy held by L. F. Fitzhardinge, A.N.U.
- Lang, J. D. *An Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales*. 2 vols. London 1875.
- Learmonth, N. F. *Portland Bay Settlement*. Melbourne 1934.
- Levy, M. C. I. *Governor George Arthur*. Melbourne 1953.
- Lhotsky, J. ['An Impartial Observer']. *Illustrations of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Colony of New South Wales*. Sydney 1835.
- Lillie, J. *A Sermon*. . . . Hobart 1837.
- Lillie, J. *A Letter from the Rev. John Lillie*. . . . Hobart 1837.
- Lillie, J. *Lecture upon the Advantages of Science*. . . . Hobart 1839.
- Lillie, J. *Knowledge as the Means of Correcting Prejudice*. . . . Hobart 1843.
- Lillie, J. 'The Perception of the Beautiful.' Pp. 3-8 in *Lectures Delivered at the Mechanics' Institute*. . . . 1849. Hobart 1849.
- Loch, J. D. *An Account of the Introduction and Effects of the System of General Religious Education Established in Van Diemen's Land in 1839*. Hobart 1843.

- Lowe, R. *The Speech of Robert Lowe . . . on Tuesday the 7th of August, 1849*. Sydney 1849. Concerns the F. T. C. Russell case.
- Lowe, R. *Speech on the Australian Colonies Bill*. . . London 1850.
- Macalister, C. *Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South*. Goulburn 1907.
- Macarthur, J. *New South Wales; Its present state and future prospects*. London 1837.
- Macarthur, J., & Wentworth, W. C. *Speeches . . . on the . . . Resumption of Transportation*. Sydney 1850.
- McCombie, T. *Australian Sketches*. Melbourne 1847.
- McCulloch, S. C. 'Sir George Gipps and Captain Alexander Maconochie.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. vii, pp. 387-405 (1957).
- McCulloch, S. C. 'The Strange Outburst of James Stephen.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xlv, pp. 37-41 (1959). Against state aid for Jews.
- McCulloch, S. C. 'Unguarded Comments on the Administration of New South Wales, 1839-46: the Gipps-La Trobe private correspondence.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. ix, pp. 30-45 (1959).
- McEncroe, J. *The Wanderings of the Human Mind*. . . Sydney 1841.
- McGarvie, J. *A Funeral Sermon*. . . Sydney 1848.
- McGuffin, R. *Rise and Progress of Orangeism in New South Wales Vindicated*. Sydney 1872.
- McKenzie, D. *Ten Years in Australia*. London 1851. First published 1845.
- Mackie, F. *The Footprints of Our Catholic Pioneers*. Melbourne n.d.
- Macnamara, M. 'A Temperance Medal.' *Australasian Catholic Record*. Sydney, new series, vol. ix, pp. 309-16 (1932).
- Maconochie, A. *Australiana*. . . Hobart 1838.
- Maconochie, A. *Emigration*. . . London 1848.
- McRae, J. (ed.) *Report on the Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania. Number 2*. Hobart 1959. The Smith, Henty, Archer, Morris, and Burn papers.
- McRae, J. (ed.) *Report on the Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania. Number 3*. Hobart 1959. The Leake papers.
- Madgwick, R. B. *Immigration into Eastern Australia 1788-1851*. London 1937.
- Manton, J. A. *The Good Shepherd: . . . the life and death of Samuel Newham*. . . Hobart 1849.
- Marriott, F. A. *Is a Penal Colony Reconcilable with God's Constitution of Human Society*. . . ? Hobart 1847.
- Martin, A. P. *Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe*. . . 2 vols. London 1893.
- Martin, J. *The Australian Sketch Book*. Sydney 1838.
- Meaden, J. W. (ed.) *Temperance in Australia*. Melbourne 1889.
- Melbourne, A. C. V. *Early Constitutional Development in Australia. New South Wales 1788-1856*. London 1934.
- Melville, H. *The History of . . . Van Diemen's Land*. . . London 1835.
- Melville, H. *Exposition of Various Admitted Modern Theories*. Sydney 1844.
- Melville, H. *Australasia and Prison Discipline*. London 1851.
- Melville, H. *Veritas*. London 1874.
- Meredith, L. A. *Notes and Sketches of New South Wales*. London 1849. First published 1844. The author's maiden name was Twamley; her husband was Charles Meredith.
- Meredith, L. A. *My Home in Tasmania*. 2 vols. London 1852.

- Mereweather, J. D. *Diary of a Working Clergyman in Australia and Tasmania*. . . . London 1859.
- Miller, E. M. *Pressmen and Governors*. Sydney 1952.
- Miller, F. *On Unscriptural Marriages*. Hobart 1834.
- Moran, P. F. *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia*. Sydney n.d.
- Morgan, J. *Give us Light*. . . . Hobart 1850.
- Morison, A. *The Sixth Vial Poured out*. Melbourne 1848.
- Morison, A. *The Out-pouring of the Seventh Vial*. Melbourne 1848.
- Mortlock, J. F. *Experiences of a Convict*. . . . London 1865.
- Mossman, S., & Banister, T. *Australia Visited and Revisited*. London 1853.
- Mowle, P. C. *A Genealogical History of Pioneer Families of Australia*. Sydney 1948.
- Mudie, J. *The Felonry of New South Wales*. London 1837.
- Mundy, G. C. *Our Antipodes*. London 1855.
- Nadel, G. H. *Australia's Colonial Culture*. Melbourne 1957.
- Nathan, I. *The First, Second, and Third of a Series of Lectures, on the Theory and Practice of Music*. . . . Sydney 1846.
- New South Wales Temperance Society. *Half-an-Hour's Reading*. Sydney 1834. (M.L.)
- Nichols, R. S. *Lecture on the Progress of Teetotalism*. . . . Launceston 1843.
- Nixon, F. R. *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania . . . 23rd April, 1846*. Hobart 1846.
- Nixon, N. *The Pioneer Bishop in Van Diemen's Land 1843-1863*. Hobart 1953.
- Normington-Rawling, J. *Charles Harpur, an Australian*. Sydney 1962.
- O'Brien, E. M. *Life and Letters of Archpriest John Joseph Therry*. . . . Sydney 1922.
- O'Farrell, P. A. C. *A Reply to the Pamphlet of the Rev. William Trollope, A.M., Entitled 'Are the Catholics of Port Phillip Tridentine Romanists?'* Melbourne 1850.
- O'Farrell, P. A. C. *An Answer to the Pamphlet of the Rev. William Trollope, M.A., Entitled, 'A Parting Word on Tridentine Romanism.'* Melbourne 1850.
- Parkes, H. *Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History*. London 1892.
- Parkes, H. *An Emigrant's Home Letters*. Sydney 1896.
- Pastoral Letter of the Van Diemen's Land Presbytery*. Hobart 1850.
- Paul, H. *The Life of Froude*. London 1905.
- Perry, C. *A Letter from the Lord Bishop of Melbourne*. . . . London 1850.
- Perry, T. M. *Australia's First Frontier: The spread of settlement in New South Wales 1788-1829*. Melbourne 1963.
- Peyser, D. 'History of Welfare Work in Sydney.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxv, pp. 89-128, 169-212 (1939).
- Pidgeon, N. *The Life, Experience, & Journal of Nathaniel Pidgeon*. Sydney 1864.
- Pike, D. H. *Paradise of Dissent*. London 1957.
- Polding, J. B. *A Report Containing the Pastoral Address of the Right Reverend Bishop*. . . . Sydney 1836.
- Polding, J. B. *The Pastoral Instruction for Lent, 1837*. . . . Sydney 1837.
- Porush, I. 'The Story of State Aid to Jewish Establishments in New South Wales.' *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, Sydney, vol. 1, pp. 337-55 (1943) and vol. II, pp. 29-38 (1944).

- Poyser, W. T. *Cold Water Army*. Hobart 1850.
- Prout, J. S., & Rae, J. *Sydney Illustrated*. Sydney 1844.
- Pryce, E. G., & Gregor, J. *Two Journals of Missionary Tours . . .* 1843. London 1845.
- Quaife, B. *Lectures on the Prophecy and Kingdom of Christ. . .* Sydney 1848.
- Ramsay, A. M. *The Voice of the Storm*. Melbourne 1850.
- Ranken, G. *Windabyne*. London 1895.
- Reed, R. T. *Six Months in a Convent*. Sydney 1836.
- Reed, R. T. *Supplement to Six Months in a Convent*. Sydney 1836.
- Report of the Benevolent Society of New South Wales . . . 30th of June, 1839*. Sydney 1839.
- Roberts, S. H. *History of Australian Land Settlement (1788-1920)*. Melbourne 1924.
- Roberts, S. H. *The Squatting Age in Australia 1835-1847*. Melbourne 1935.
- Roman Catholic Morality, as . . . Used in Maynooth College*. Sydney 1839.
- Ross, C. S. *Colonization and Church Work in Victoria*. Melbourne 1891.
- Ross, R. *The Church, the Foundation, and the Keys*. Sydney 1848.
- Rowland, E. C. 'The Life and Times of Henry Dangar.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxxix, pp. 1-22, 49-76 (1953).
- Rusden, G. W. *National Education*. Melbourne 1853.
- Russell, F. T. C. *Statement. . .* Sydney 1849.
- Russell, H. S. *The Genesis of Queensland*. Sydney 1888.
- Salier, C. W. 'The Life and Writings of Charles Harpur.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xxxii, pp. 89-105 (1946).
- Second Report of the Van Diemen's Land Home Missionary and Christian Instruction Society, The*. Hobart 1838.
- Scott, E. 'The Resistance to Convict Transportation in Victoria, 1844-1853.' *Victorian Historical Magazine*, Melbourne, vol. 1, pp. 101-42 (1911).
- Shaw, A. G. L. 'The Origins of the Probation System in Van Diemen's Land.' *Historical Studies*, Melbourne, vol. vi, pp. 16-28 (1953).
- Shaw, W. *The Land of Promise*. London 1854.
- Singleton, J. *Narrative of Incidents in the Eventful Life of a Physician*. Melbourne 1891.
- Smith, B. *European Vision and the South Pacific 1768-1850*. Oxford 1960.
- Smith, J., see J. S.
- Stackhouse, A. *Religious Objections to Teetotal Societies Considered. . .* Launceston 1846.
- Stackhouse, A. *The Successful Pole Climber. A memoir of John Wilcox*. London 1859. The title page wrongly names the author 'Hackhouse'.
- Stoney, H. B. *A Residence in Tasmania. . .* London 1856.
- Strzelecki, P. E. de. *Physical Description of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land*. London 1845.
- Sutor, G. *The Culture of the Grapevine, and the Orange, in Australia and New Zealand*. London 1843.
- Sweetman, E. *Victoria's First Public Educationist*. Melbourne 1939. A study of James Forbes.
- Sweetman, E. *The Educational Activities in Victoria of the Rt. Hon. H. C. E. Childers*. Melbourne 1940.
- Sydney Morning Herald. A Century of Journalism*. Sydney 1931.
- Syme, J. *Nine Years in Van Diemen's Land*. Dundee 1848.

- Therry, R. *Explanation of the Plan of the Irish National Schools*. . . . Sydney 1836.
- Therry, R. *Reminiscences of Thirty Years' Residence in New South Wales and Victoria*. . . . London 1863.
- Thomas, L. *The Development of the Labour Movement in the Sydney District of New South Wales*. Canberra 1962.
- Thomson, J. *Remarks on the Status of the Presbyterian Church, in the British Colonies*. . . . Hobart 1835.
- Thomson, J. *Vindication of the Presbytery of Van Diemen's Land*. . . . Hobart 1839.
- Thorpe, O. *First Catholic Mission to the Australian Aborigines*. Sydney 1950.
- Tocqueville, A. de. *Democracy in America* (Reeve text; F. Bowen and P. Bradley, eds.). 2 vols. New York 1953. First published 1835.
- The Touchstone of the New Religion*. Sydney 1835.
- Townsley, W. A. *The Struggle for Self-Government in Tasmania 1842-1856*. Hobart 1951.
- Trollope, W. *Are the Catholics of Port Phillip Tridentine Romanists?* Melbourne 1850.
- Trollope, W. *The Roman Catholics of Port Phillip and their Champion. A parting word on Tridentine Romanism*. Melbourne 1850.
- Ullathorne, W. B. *The Catholic Mission in Australasia*. Liverpool 1837.
- Ullathorne, W. B. *A Reply to Judge Burton*. Sydney 1840.
- Ullathorne, W. B. *Autobiography*. London 1891. Expurgated, but not wholly superseded by the following item.
- Ullathorne, W. B. *From Cabin-Boy to Archbishop* (S. Leslie, ed.). London 1941. The full first draft of Ullathorne's autobiography.
- Van Diemen's Land Home Missionary etc. Society, see *Second Report*.
- Van Diemen's Land Presbytery, see *Pastoral Letter*.
- Vidal, M. T. *Tales for the Bush*. London 1846.
- Walker, W. *Reminiscences of a Fifty Years' Residence at Windsor*. . . . Sydney 1890.
- Ward, J. *Perils, Pastimes and Pleasures of an Emigrant*. London 1849.
- Ward, J. M. *Earl Grey and the Australian Colonies 1846-1857*. Melbourne 1958.
- Ward, R. B. *The Australian Legend*. Melbourne 1958.
- Watsford, J. *Glorious Gospel Triumphs*. London 1901.
- Watson, J. F. *The History of Sydney Hospital from 1811 to 1911*. Sydney 1911.
- Webb, W. P. *The Great Frontier*. London 1953.
- Wellings, H. P. 'Ben Boyd's Labour Supplies.' *J.R.A.H.S.*, vol. xix, pp. 374-84 (1933).
- Wentworth, W. C. *Two Speeches Delivered by William Charles Wentworth, Esq.* Sydney 1893. First published 1850.
- West, J. *The Fine Arts*. Launceston 1848.
- West, J. *The Voluntary Support of the Christian Ministry Alone Scriptural and Defensible*. Hobart 1849.
- West, J. *The History of Tasmania*. 2 vols. Launceston 1852.
- Westgarth, W. *Address by the Committee of the Mechanics' Institute at Melbourne*. Edinburgh 1846.

- Westgarth, W. *Commercial and Statistical Report on the Colony of Port Phillip*. . . . Melbourne 1844. The first of a series, published in pamphlets and later in the *Illustrated Australian Magazine*.
- Westgarth, W. *A Report on the Conditions, Capabilities, and Prospects of the Australian Aborigines*. Melbourne 1846.
- Whittington, F. T. *William Grant Broughton*. Sydney 1936.
- Williams, J. L. *Australian Club Centenary, 1938*. Sydney 1938.
- Willson, R. W. *Pastoral*. Hobart 1849. Concerns the Roman uprising against the Pope.
- Wilmot, W. B. *The Natural and Spiritual Mind Considered in relation to Rational Education and Religious Instruction*. Melbourne 1850. (State Library of Victoria.)
- Winskill, P. T. *The Temperance Movement and its Workers*. 4 vols. Edinburgh 1890-2.
- Woodward, F. J. *The Doctor's Disciples*. Oxford 1954. Includes a study of J. P. Gell.
- Woolls, W. *A Tract for the Times*. . . . Parramatta 1849.
- Woolls, W. *Postscript to the Tract for the Times*. . . . Parramatta 1849.
- Wright, J. A. *The Generations of Men*. Melbourne 1959.
- Wroe, J. *Private Communications Given to John Wroe*. Vol. III. Gravesend, 1853.

II: CONTEMPORARY PERIODICALS

- Arden's Sydney Magazine*. 1843. Monthly; two issues.
- Argus*, Melbourne. 1846- . Daily.
- Atlas*, Sydney. 1844-8. Weekly.
- Australasian*, Melbourne. 1850-1. Monthly.
- Australasian Sporting Magazine*, Sydney. 1850-1. Monthly.
- Australia Felix Monthly Magazine*, Geelong. 1849. Three issues.
- Australian*, Sydney. 1824-48. Daily.
- Australian Era*, Sydney. 1850-1. Monthly.
- Australian Medical Journal*, Sydney. 1846-7. Monthly.
- Australian Penny Journal*, Sydney. 1848-9. Monthly.
- Australian Temperance Magazine*, Sydney. 1838-40. Monthly.
- Bell's Life in Sydney*. 1845- . Weekly.
- Britannia and Trades' Advocate*, Hobart. 1846-51. Weekly.
- Christian Standard*, Sydney. 1848-9. Weekly.
- Chronicle*, Sydney. 1839-48. Thrice weekly. First *Australian*, then *Morning*, then *Sydney Chronicle*. A Mitchell Library file for 1839 is marked for contributors.
- Citizen*, Sydney. 1846-7. Weekly.
- Colonial Literary Journal*, Sydney. 1844-5. Weekly.
- Colonial Observer*, Sydney. 1841-4. Twice weekly.
- Colonial Times*, Hobart. 1825- . Twice weekly.
- Colonist*, Sydney. 1835-40. Thrice weekly.
- Elector*, Sydney. 27 July 1848. A news-sheet upholding Robert Lowe's candidature for Sydney.
- Empire*, Sydney. 1850- . Daily.
- Examiner*, Launceston. 1842- . Thrice weekly.

- Free Press and Commercial Journal*, Sydney. 1841-2. Later issues entitled *Sydney Free Press*.
- Freeman's Journal*, Sydney, 1850- . Weekly.
- Gleaner*, Sydney. 1847-8. Weekly.
- Guardian*, Sydney. 1844. Weekly. The journal of the Mutual Protection Association.
- Guardian*, Sydney. 1848-50. Monthly. The Anglican journal.
- Heads of the People*, Sydney. 1847-8. Fortnightly.
- Hobart Town Advertiser*. 1839- . Twice weekly.
- Hobart Town Courier*. 1827- . Thrice weekly.
- Hobart Town Herald*. 1845-6. Weekly. Later issues entitled *Herald of Tasmania*.
- Hobart Town Herald and Total Abstinence Advocate*. 1846-7. Weekly.
- Hobartton Guardian; or True Friend of Tasmania*. 1847- . Weekly. In early months the title lacked *Hobartton*.
- Illustrated Australian Magazine*, Melbourne. 1850- . Monthly.
- Irish Exile and Freedom's Advocate*, Hobart. 1850-1. Weekly.
- Literary News*. Sydney. 1837-8. Weekly.
- Maitland Mercury*. 1843- . Twice weekly.
- Melbourne Church of England Messenger*. 1850- . Monthly.
- Melbourne Presbyterian Magazine and Victoria Review*. 1850-1. Monthly.
- Monitor*, Sydney. 1826-41. Twice weekly.
- Moreton Bay Courier*, Brisbane. 1846- . Weekly.
- New South Wales Magazine*, Sydney. 1843. Monthly.
- New South Wales Sporting Magazine*, Sydney. 1848-9. Monthly. Four issues, the last entitled *New South Wales Sporting and Literary Magazine, and Racing Calendar*.
- Observer, a Van Diemen's Land Journal of Politics*, Hobart. 1845-6. Weekly.
- People's Advocate*, Sydney. 1848- . Weekly. A Mitchell Library file is marked for Parkes's contributions.
- Politician*, Sydney. 1851. Monthly; two issues.
- Port Phillip Christian Herald*, Melbourne. 1850-1. Monthly. Later issues entitled *Victorian Christian Herald*.
- Port Phillip Gazette*, Melbourne. 1838-51. Daily.
- Port Phillip Herald*, Melbourne. 1840-8. Daily.
- Press*, Sydney. 1851. Weekly.
- Record*, Sydney. 1843-4. Weekly.
- Representative*, Sydney. 1850. Daily. A news-sheet upholding J. D. Lang's candidature for Sydney.
- Sentinel*, Sydney. 1845-8. Weekly.
- Sidney's Emigrant's Journal*, London. 1848-50. Weekly. Later entitled *Sidney's Emigrant's Journal and Traveller's Magazine*.
- Simmonds's Colonial Magazine*, London. 1844- . Monthly. Later entitled *Colonial Magazine and Asiatic Review*.
- Southern Queen*, Sydney. 1845. Weekly.
- Sporting Times*, Sydney. 1848. Weekly.
- Standard and Colonial Advocate*, Sydney. 1839. Weekly.
- Standard; or Mechanics' and Working Man's Journal*, Melbourne. 1845. Weekly.

- Star and Working Man's Guardian*, Sydney. 1844-6. Weekly.
Sun and New South Wales Independent Press, Sydney. 1843. Weekly.
Sydney Gazette. 1803-42. Thrice weekly.
Sydney Morning Herald. 1831- . Daily. Until 1842 entitled *Sydney Herald*.
Sydney Protestant Magazine. 1840-1. Monthly.
Sydney Times. 1834-8. Twice weekly.
Tasmanian & (Austral-Asiatic) Review, Hobart. 1834-45. Weekly. For further information on the extremely complex bibliographic history of R. L. Murray's journals see E. M. Miller, *Pressmen and Governors*, pp. 173 et seq.
Tasmanian Magazine and Masonic Register, Launceston. 1849; one issue.
Tasmanian Weekly Dispatch, Hobart. 1839-41.
Teetotal Advocate, Launceston. 1843. Weekly.
Teetotaler and General Newspaper, Sydney. 1842-3. Weekly.
Temperance Advocate, Sydney. 1840-1. Weekly.
Temperance Banner, Hobart. 1850-1. Weekly. Later entitled *Standard of Tasmania*.
True Catholic, Hobart. 1843. Monthly.
True Colonist, Hobart. 1832-44. Weekly.
Van Diemen's Land Monthly Magazine, Hobart. 1835. Four issues.
Van Diemen's Land Temperance Herald, Launceston. 1845-9(?). Irregular.
Victoria Courier and Working Man's Advocate, Geelong. 1849. Irregular.
Weekly Register of Politics, Facts and General Literature, Sydney. 1843-5.

III: OFFICIAL SOURCES

- Accounts and Papers of the House of Commons*. The particular items used are identified in footnotes. See also *H. of C. Papers* under 'Abbreviations and Usages'.
- Colonial Office Papers*. These are available on microfilm at major Australian libraries and include the following important series:
- 201—Correspondence to the Colonial Office concerning New South Wales. This includes despatches, communications from other public offices, and letters from private individuals. Most items bear minutes from C.O. officials, and often draft replies are appended.
 - 262—Despatches to the Administrators of New South Wales.
 - 264—Blue Books (annual statistics) for New South Wales.
 - 280—Correspondence of the Colonial Office concerning Tasmania (see note to 201).
 - 282—Tasmanian sessional papers. These include the proceedings of the Executive Council.
 - 284—Blue Books (annual statistics) for Tasmania.
 - 408—Despatches to the Administrators of Tasmania.
- The Hobart Town Gazette*. 1816- . Published government notices of many kinds, including statutes.
- The New South Wales Government Gazette*. 1816- . Equivalent of the above.
- New South Wales Legislative Council: Votes and Proceedings*, with relevant *Papers*. The particular items used are identified in the text. See also *V. & P.* and *L.C. Papers* under 'Abbreviations and Usages'.
- Van Diemen's Land Legislative Council: Votes and Proceedings*, with relevant *Papers*. Equivalent of above. Publication was haphazard in form and should

be traced through the annual entries in J. A. Ferguson's *Bibliography of Australia*.

New South Wales National Board of Education Papers. These are held at the Mitchell Library and include Board minutes and inward correspondence.

IV: NON-OFFICIAL MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Mitchell Library

- G. Arthur papers: letters from J. L. Pedder 1832-46 (A2170).
- A. Berry papers: vol. v, letters from Berry 1809-73 (uncatalogued).
- R. Bourke papers: in-letters to Bourke (uncatalogued).
- W. Campbell papers (A3587).
- A. Cunningham papers: inward letters 1845-6 (A3180).
- Dowling papers: J. S. Dowling correspondence. 2 vols. (A486).
- E. Deas Thomson papers. 3 vols. (A1531).
- W. A. Duncan papers:
 - autobiography 1811-54 (A2877).
 - diary 1856 (A2879).
 - Lecture on Science and Commerce (A2878).
 - Memoranda and literary journal 1845-53 (A2876).
- W. Gardner, Northern and Western Districts of New South Wales. 2 vols (A176).
- J. Goodwin, Education for Children in the Bush. Part published in *People's Advocate*, 15 February 1851 and subsequent issues (B923-4).
- A. C. Grant, Early Station Life in Queensland (A858).
- E. S. Hall, Credulity of Deism (A3221).
- C. Harpur papers (A87-98):
 - miscellaneous (A1131).
 - Poems 1847-8 (C382).
- G. Hobler's diaries 1834-48 (C425-6).
- King papers:
 - correspondence 1830-1917 (A1977).
 - miscellaneous (Ak8).
- J. D. Lang papers: inward letters 1820-54 (A2226).
- A. A. C. Le Souef, Personal Recollections of Early Victoria (A2762).
- List of provisional members of Coolie Association 1842-3 (A2029).
- Macarthur papers:
 - Camden District Council minutes and miscellanea 1843-65 (A2987).
 - Camden Park furniture and pictures 1835-1900 (A2973).
 - Church of England 1839-1909 (A2995).
 - education: Camden Park primary school 1841-79 (A2981).
 - letters from Sir R. Therry 1851-66 (A2930).
 - letters to Sir W. Macarthur 1821-57 (A2936).
 - Sir E. Macarthur's emigration correspondence (A2918).
 - J. Macarthur, in-letters 1819-46 (A2922).
 - J. Macarthur, letters and manuscripts 1819-67 (A2920).
 - J. Macarthur, J. C. Pott and the *Australian* 1842-50 (A2927).
 - public questions 1824-66 (A2988).
- J. McGarvie's diary 1843-7 (A2062).
- J. Martin papers: miscellanea (uncatalogued).

- New South Wales Parliament, Petitions 1833-50 (A286).
 J. Orton:
 journals (A1714-15).
 letter-books (A1717-18-19).
 H. Parkes's correspondence, H-I-J (A923).
 J. Saunders scrapbook (B1106).
 Tasmanian Total Abstinence Agency Papers (A585).
 Temperance pledge, signed by Gipps and others (At71).
 Tindal letter-book (A2068).
 N. Turner:
 journal 1836-46 (A1837).
 letter-book 1836-49 (A1838).
 Personal Narrative 1793-1846 (A1835-6).
 Wentworth papers: letters from W. C. Wentworth (A756).
 Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society—Australia district, minutes 1838-45 (A2806).

Other Repositories

- T. Arnold papers: letters from Arnold in New Zealand and Tasmania (Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand).
 N. Black papers: notes made by M. Kiddle from the originals in the Archives of the State Library of Victoria, 1954 (A.N.U.).
 W. G. Broughton papers: microfilm copy of the originals at Diocesan House, Sydney (National Library of Australia).
 G. T. W. B. Boyes's diary: typescript extracts from the originals in the library of the Royal Society of Tasmania (Tasmanian State Archives).
 Lady J. Franklin's diary in New South Wales (National Library of Australia).
 W. E. Gladstone papers: microfilm extracts of the originals in the British Museum (Tasmanian State Archives).
 G. Hawke's diary (National Library of Australia).
 A. Laurie papers (State Library of Victoria).
 London Missionary Society, Australian correspondence: microfilm copy of the originals held by the Society (National Library of Australia).
 T. A. Murray papers (National Library of Australia).

Theses (available at respective Universities)

- Crowley, F. K. Working Class Conditions in Australia 1788-1851. Ph.D. thesis, Melbourne 1949.
 French, E. L. Secondary Education in the Australian Social Order 1788-1898. Ph.D. thesis, Melbourne 1958.
 Hume, L. J. The Labour Movement in New South Wales and Victoria 1830-1860. M.Ec. thesis, Sydney 1960.
 Nadel, G. H. Mid-Nineteenth Century Political Thought in Australia. M.A. thesis, Melbourne 1950.
 Rawson, D. W. Factions in New South Wales Politics, 1820-1840. M.A. thesis, Melbourne 1949.

- Suttor, T. L. L. The Catholic Church in the Australian Colonies, 1840-65.
Ph.D. thesis, A.N.U. 1960.
- Waller, K. G. T. The Letters of the Leslie Brothers in Australia, 1834-1854.
B.A. thesis, Queensland 1956.

INDEX

- Aaron, I., 192, 194
à Beckett, A., 54-5, 179
à Beckett, W., 54-5, 82, 168
Aborigines, 180; attitudes towards (European workers') 119, (*Herald's*) 27, (liberals') 160-1, (pastoralists') 62, 66-7, 71, 73; forbidden liquor, 190; missions, 126
Adam, M. T., 167-8, 173, 190
Adelaide (South Aust.), 112, 118, 124
Age (Sydney), 94
Aikenhead, J., 199
Allen, G.: and Temperance, 171, 172, 180, 181, 188; biography, 84; Methodist, 128; morality, 195; Sydney Councillor, 84, 88, 97
'Antients', 36-7, 40
Anstey, T. C., 111, 114-15
Anti-transportation movement, 4; gen-try attitude, 47, 56; significance, 198-201; support for (Church of Eng-land) 17-18, (*Herald*) 27; (working-class and radical) 85, 92-3, 94-5, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100-2, 108, 205
Architecture, 156-7
Arden, G., 159
Argus (Melbourne), 163
Arnold, T., jnr, 154, 175
Arnold, T., snr, 22, 23
Art and art unions, 156, 186, 195
Arthur, G., 2, 36, 99, 119, 129
Atlas (Sydney): anti-clerical, 173, 174, 176-7; general liberalism, 78, 148, 152, 160, 177, 195, 198, 203; hostile to ex-ecutive, 47; support for squatting, 63, 64, 70
Austin, A. G., 184-5
Australasian (Melbourne), 156, 203
Australasian League for the Abolition of Transportation, 4, 18, 200
Australia Felix Monthly Magazine (Geelong), 33-4, 159-60
Australian Club, 38, 47, 54
Australian College, 69
Australian Colonies Government Act, 2, 46, 53, 55, 65, 87, 108
Australian Era (Sydney): anti-trans-portion, 200; culture and educa-tion, 156, 158, 159, 185, 191, 202, 203; hostile to squatting, 75; sponsorship, 154
Australian League, 97
Australian Library, 38, 61, 153, 157
Australian Medical Journal (Sydney), 158, 162
Australian Methodists, 131-2, 171
Australian Mutual Provident Society, 193-4
Australian Patriotic Association, 25, 28, 81-3, 90, 106
Australian Penny Journal (Sydney), 186
Australian Schools Society, 125
Australian Temperance Magazine (Sydney), 165, 166, 167
Australian Total Abstinence Society, 181, 187
Australian Union Benefit Society, 193-4
Australians, native-born, 1, 16, 34, 47, 79-88, 96, 99, 108
Backhouse, J., 126, 165
Badgery family, 35
Bailey, W., 100-2
Baptist Church and its followers, 4, 125, 127-9, 135, 155, 158, 178
Barnett, W., 131
Barrett, W., 126
Bateman, G., 132
Bathurst, H., 6, 14
Bathurst (N.S.W.), 9, 35, 62, 137, 152
Baylis family, 36
Beazley, J., 128
Bedford, W., jnr, 19
Bedford, W., snr, 133
Bell, A., 36
Bellingham's Reading Room, 153
Bell's Life in Sydney, 86, 88, 96, 189, 192
Benefit societies, 167, 183, 193, 194
Benevolent Society of New South Wales, 93, 139, 193
Bennett, S., 35, 69
Berrima (N.S.W.), 9, 48
Berry, A., 36, 41, 48, 49, 52
Bible societies, 112, 120, 125, 133, 137
Bigge, J. T., 6, 14, 35, 36, 99
Black, N., 66, 72, 76
Blair, D., 129, 195
Bland, W.: attitudes towards (corn law) 49, (squatting) 74, (Roman Catholicism) 105, 176; liberal poli-tician, 80, 82-3, 91, 94-7 *passim*; sur-geon, 158
Blaxland, J., and family, 36, 40, 48, 62
Bligh, W., 40, 64, 91
Blomfield family, 36
Bogue, A., 97
Bonwick, J.: and Temperance, 167, 168, 181, 187-90 *passim*; educationist, 154-5; religion, 179; sympathy with aborigines, 161

- Bookshops, 156
 Bothwell (Tas.), 8, 38, 48, 135
 Bourke, R., 36, 55, 83, 160, 173; land policy, 2, 50, 62; political liberalism, 24, 25-6, 41-2, 43, 53, 55, 78, 168; religious and educational liberalism, 5, 18, 104-5, 111, 114, 121, 139, 176, 190, 191
 Bowen, G. M. C., 143
 Bowman, G., 37
 Bowman, J., 39
 Bowman, W., 45
 Bowman family, 35
 Boyce, W. B., 128, 140, 188
 Boyd, A., 63, 68, 69, 71, 72
 Boyd, B., 33, 63, 64, 68, 69, 71-2, 76
 Boyd, H. V., 162
 Boyd family, 55
 Boyd Town (N.S.W.), 2, 7, 9, 76
 Boydell family, 36
 Boyes, G. T. W. B., 55, 77-8
 Bradley family, 35
 Braim, T. H., 15, 129, 157, 206
 Bramble, — (workman), 42
 Brewster, E. J., 196
 Brisbane, T. M., 36
 Brisbane, *see* Moreton Bay
 Brisbane School of Arts, 113, 187
 Brisbane Water, 7, 42
Britannia and Trades' Advocate (Hobart), 100, 117, 137
 Broughton, T., 84
 Broughton, W. G.: conservative beliefs (democracy) 64, (moral enlightenment) 175-6, (Protestants and Protestantism) 136, 143, (religion and society) 14-23, 130, 132, 133, 139, 141, (Roman Catholicism) 109, 118, 119; hostile to Temperance, 180, 181; representative of conservative attitudes, 29, 31, 35, 39, 55, 65, 74, 76, 81, 140, 177, 191, 204, 206
 Browne, T. A., 66
 Browning, C. A., 197
 Building societies, 195
 Buller, C., 82
 Bulwer, H. L., 82
 Bunce, D., 157
 Burton, W. W., 18, 26, 55, 82, 104, 118, 168
 Byrne, A., 139
 California (U.S.A.), 28, 32, 98, 137
 Camden (N.S.W.), 9, 35, 45, 46, 48, 110
 Campbell, C., 45, 47, 48, 71, 76, 185
 Campbell, F., 162, 192
 Campbell, R., jnr, 83, 97
 Campbell, R., snr, 41, 54
 Campbell, W. (squire), 36
 Campbell, W. (squatter), 76
 Campbelltown (N.S.W.), 9, 35, 115
 Campbell Town (Tas.), 8, 194
 Cape, T. W., 154
 Capital punishment and its abolition, 31, 197, 198
 Carcoar (N.S.W.), 9, 185
 Carmichael, H., 126, 143, 154, 178
 Carter, W., 101-2
 Cartwright, R., 13
 Cassilis (N.S.W.), 9, 45
 Cemeteries, 21, 114, 138, 191
 Census schedule controversy, 82, 105
 Channing, E., 147, 177, 193
 Chapman, T. D., 100
 Cheeke, A., 86
 Childers, H. C. E., 154, 185, 203
 Chisholm, C.: attitudes to working class, 80, 98; hostile to squatters, 73; praised by R. Lowe, 177; Roman Catholic, 108, 110, 114, 123, 137; sympathetic to emancipists, 80
 Christ College, 23
 Christian Brothers, 116
 Christian Israelism, 127; *see also* Wroe, J.
Christian Standard (Sydney), 126, 143
Chronicle (Sydney), 104, 105-6, 107, 108, 112-15 *passim*, 123
 Church and Schools Corporation, 14, 21, 120
 Church of England, 4, 5, 6, 111, 155, 184, 202, 209-10; conservative force in society, 13-23, 28, 33, 39, 54, 55; criticized by liberals, 175-6; hostile to Temperance, 180-1; Protestant dissidence, 125, 132-3, 135, 135-7, 143; *see also* Broughton, W. G.; Church and Schools Corporation; Consistorial Court; Nixon, F. R.; Perry, C.; State aid; Tractarian movement
 Church of Scotland, Disruption, 130, 131
 Church Missionary Society, 126
Citizen (Sydney), 94
 Clarence River (N.S.W.), 9, 71
 Clarke, W. B., 22
 Class and class divisions, 1, 17, 105; gentry, 39-41, 67-9, 73, 105; merchant, 72; pastoralists and squatters, 67-70, 71, 73; small farmers and yeomanry, 39, 70-1; working class, 71, 89, 187-8; *see also* 'Respectability'
 Clifford, W., 88, 187
 Close family, 36
 Cobbitty (N.S.W.), 9, 48
 Cockburn, Captain, 195
 Coghill, J., 45
 Coleridge, E., 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 64
Colonial Literary Journal (Sydney), 75, 151, 159, 161
Colonial Observer (Sydney), 137, 181
 Colonial Sugar Refinery Company, 154
Colonial Times (Hobart), 113, 117, 135, 156, 176, 177
Colonist (Sydney), 137, 170

- Coloured labour: Chinese, 53, 72;
coolie migration, 18, 105; Indian, 53,
72; opposition to, 72, 92-3; Pacific
islanders, 53, 72, 73
- Commercial Reading Room, 153
- Communications, 158-9, 185-6
- Condell, H., 139
- Congregationalism and its followers,
125, 126, 128, 132, 135, 136, 142, 155,
165
- Conolly, P., 117, 118, 119
- Consistorial Court: N.S.W., 20, 176;
Tas., 120, 131, 135, 136, (Church-
State conflict) 19
- Constitutional Association, 96-7, 97-8,
194
- Constitutional issues, 1-3, 99, 106, 108;
conservative views, 16, 26, 27, 31, 33,
34; gentry attitudes, 42-7; movements
for change, 77-9, 81-2; *see also* Dis-
trict Councils; Self-government
- Convicts, *see* Transportation of con-
victs
- Cook-Westmoreland electoral district,
7, 86, 121
- Cooper, R., 91, 166, 205
- Coppinger, W., 112
- Cowper, C., 17, 45, 64, 79, 83, 87, 191
- Cowper, W., 13
- Cox, G., 39
- Crook, W. P., 165
- Cumberland County (N.S.W.), 7, 45,
87, 106
- Curr, E., and family, 69, 106, 120, 139
- Curr, J., 158
- Dalgarno, Mrs., 169, 189, 200
- Dangar, H., 46, 63
- D'Arcy, M., 107, 113, 123
- Darling, R., 33, 36
- Darlinghurst gaol, 192, 197
- Davidson, G. F., 40, 72
- Davies, R. R., 143
- Davis, C. H., 116
- Davis, J., 129
- Deas Thomson, E., 25, 52, 55, 56, 94,
120, 168
- Denison, Lady, 39
- Denison, W. T., 49, 168; conservative
belief, 55-6, 78; dismissal of A.
Montagu, 29, 77; political manoeuv-
ring, 38, 47, 100, 101, 102, 109; re-
ligious and educational issues, 6, 120,
129, 135, 191
- Denney, J., 100
- Digby, J. T., 192
- 'Dismemberment' of N.S.W., 2, 50, 52,
82-3, 91
- District councils, 30, 41, 45-6, 77, 78,
106-7
- Dixon, J., 118
- Donaldson, S. A., 38, 54
- Donnison, J., 42
- Douglass, H. G., 87, n.52
- Dowling, H., 194
- Dowling, J., 21, 47, 82, 168, 195
- Dowling, V., 75
- Drama, 155-6
- Drapers' assistants, 153, 187
- Dry, R., and family, 36, 37; *see also*
'Patriotic Six'
- Drysdale, R., and family, 39, 69
- Duncan, W. A.: critic of gentry, 50,
68; editor of *Chronicle* and *Weekly*
Register, 105-7, 123; on Temperance,
173; political radicalism, 90-1, 92, 95,
119, 151, 152, 187, 202; Roman Cath-
olic liberal, 110, 113-14, 115
- Dungog (N.S.W.), 9, 120
- Dunn, J., 100
- Eardley-Wilmot, J. E., 100, 168, 198;
controversies (religion and educa-
tion) 5, 19, 22, 120, 135, (self-gov-
ernment) 38, 39, 47, 55, 77, 78;
dismissal, 20, 195, 198
- Eccleston, J., 154, 175, 179
- Edmondston, J., 133
- Education, 4, 5, 28, 32, 39, 95, 101, 174,
197, 204-5, 209-10; and phrenology,
161-2; and Temperance, 167; Church
of England, 18, 21-3; compulsion
question, 27, 113; exclusion of theo-
logy, 178-9; liberal enthusiasm,
150-5; Protestant, 125-6, 135, 139, 143;
Roman Catholic, 103, 111-12, 113,
121; spread, 184-5; *see also* State aid
- Edwards, W., 163
- Electricity, 158
- Elwin, H., 54
- Emancipists (ex-convicts): and re-
ligion, 104; civil and political rights,
26, 43, 82-5, 101; 'exclusives' (clash
with) 43-4, 85, (constitutional alli-
ance) 83; political attitude, 79, (and
liberalism) 79-88 *passim*; social
status, 31, 53, 79, 80-1, 83, 85, 88
- Empire* (Sydney), 97, 148
- Evangelical Union, 126, 128, 142
- Ewing, R. K., 140, 141
- Ewing, T. J., 186
- Examiner* (Launceston), 33, 159;
against transportation, 199, 200; cool
towards Temperance, 173, 181, 189;
religious toleration, 136; self-govern-
ment and democracy, 79
- Fairfax, J., 27-8, 31, 128, 173
- Faithfull family, 35
- Faunce, Captain, 42
- Fawcner, J. P., 128
- Female Factory, Parramatta, 120
- Fenn Kemp, A., and family, 35, 37, 40
- Fish River (N.S.W.), 35
- Fitzgerald, R., 85, 87, 88, 96, 106, 108,
120

- FitzRoy, C. A., 47, 69, 88, 97, 188; conservative belief, 56-7, 96; mobbed, 99; morality criticized, 87-8, 195; praises police reform, 191
- Flood, E., 84
- Flynn, J., 122
- Forbes, F., 55, 168
- Forbes, J., 126, 131, 139, 141, 154
- Forster, T., 33
- Forster, T. H., 184
- Forster, W., 75-6
- Foss, A., 128
- Franklin, Lady, 169, 197
- Franklin, J., 38, 49, 55, 168; criticized by Roman Catholics, 119; education, 5, 22, 23; supports Presbyterians, 134, 135
- Free Labour Union, 100
- Free thought, 88, 174-5, 179, 189
- Free Tradesmen's Association, 100
- Freeman's Journal* (Sydney), 104, 108, 110, 121
- Freemasonry, 85, 113, 163, 177, 193
- Froude, J. A., 154, 175
- Fry, H. P.: Church of England publicist, 15, 22, 136, 155; on popular morality, 184, 188, 203; penologist, 197, 199, 201
- Fulton, H., 13
- Fyans, F., 62, 66
- Gannon, M., 87
- Gardening, 157
- Gardner, W., 66
- Geelong (Vic.), 2, 8, 126, 127, 152, 163
- Gell, J. P., and the College, 19, 22-3, 111, 115, 120, 135-6, 153, 175
- Geoghegan, P. B., 117
- George III* wrecked, 191
- Gibson family, 36
- Gilbert, G. A., 163, 180
- Gipps, Lady, 169
- Gipps, G., 28, 55, 83, 93, 191, 196; administration of justice, 27; and colonial nobility, 41; and corn law, 49; land policy, 2, 19, 29, 46, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 74; on coloured labour, 73; on education, morality and religion, 5, 121, 122, 129, 130, 186, 195; opposition to, 47, 64, 77; political factionalism, 82, 83, 91, 92; praise for, 75, 92, 107-8; relations with Roman Catholics, 114, 118, 119, 120, 177; support of Temperance, 168, 173, 188, 190, 206
- Gladstone, W. E., 3, 4, 5, 20, 22, 71, 154, 181
- Gladstone colony, 3
- Gleaner* (Sydney), 126
- Gold discoveries, 1, 4, 32, 52, 65, 98, 160
- Goold, J. A., 117, 120
- Goulburn (N.S.W.), 9, 35, 41, 152
- Graff, E., 142
- Gregory, H. G., 108, 115-16, 124
- Gregory, J., 55
- Gregson, T. G., 47, 101, 102
- Grey, H. G.: election for Melbourne, 30; place in anti-transportation controversy, 4, 96, 199-200, 201; rulings on religious matters, 21, 120, 181, 191
- Grono, J., 36
- Guardian* (Sydney, radical journal), 93-4
- Guardian* (Sydney and Hobart, Church of England journals), 15 n.2
- Hall, E. S.: expounder of 'Australian Legend', 201, 204; political radicalism, 64, 79, 80, 95, 96; religious beliefs, 175-9 *passim*
- Hall, W., 111, 113, 116, 120
- Haller, F., 128, 135, 140
- Halloran, H., 161
- Hamilton, E., 41, 45, 53, 68, 71
- Hamilton, J., 162
- Hamilton, W., 141, 143-4
- Harper, G., 48
- Harpur, C.: beliefs (religious), 177, 178, 180, 204, (Transcendental) 114, 148, 150, 193, 202, 206; on capital punishment, 198; poet, 151, 155-6, 174; on squatting and W. C. Wentworth, 74-5, 107; on transportation, 200; political radical, 88; sympathy with aborigines, 161; Temperance supporter, 167, 168-9, 182, 188, 195
- Harpur, J. J., 188, 195
- Harris, A., 180, 182, 186, 198, 204
- Hawksley, E. J., 79, 96-9 *passim*, 108, 113, 121, 139, 187
- Hay, R. W., 36
- Haygarth, G. W., 203
- Heads of the People* (Sydney), 156, 167, 179, 186, 197-8
- Henry, M. W., 97
- Henty, W., 54
- Herald*, see *Sydney Morning Herald*
- Herald of Tasmania* (Hobart), 15, 136
- Heydon, J. K., 95, 96, 108
- Hill, G., 84, 88, 97
- Hipkiss, R., 90, 96, 187, 194
- Hobart (Tas.), 8, 35, 128, 154, 156, 193, 194, 200; cultural activity, 151, 153, 156; mesmerism, 163; municipal government, 102; population (Tas.) 207-8; religious issues, 111, 112, 116, 118, 131, 133, 134; Temperance, 165, 167, 172, 181, 189
- Hobart Mechanics' Institute, 152, 158, 173, 187, 188
- Hobart Town Advertiser*, 135
- Hobart Town Courier*, 33, 115, 151, 157
- Hobart Town Dispensary, 193
- Hobart Town High School, 126, 135, 154-8 *passim*, 160, 175

- Hobart Town Horticultural Society, 157
Hobart Town Trade Union, 100, 102
Hobartian Guardian, 100-1, 109, 116, 153, 166, 195
Hobler, G., and family, 69, 76
Hodgson, C. P., 64, 76
Holden, J. R., 87, 97
Hollinshed, H., 85, 94
Holy Guild of St Mary and St Joseph, 121-2, 123
Hood, J., 205
Hopkins, H., 128, 135
Hosking, J., 84
Howe, E., 101-2
Hunter River (N.S.W.), and settlers, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 53
Hunter River Agricultural Society, 157
Huon River (Tas.), and settlement, 7, 116, 182
Hutchins, W., 18, 20, 22, 134, 135
Hutchins School, Hobart, 23, 135
Hyndman, C. R., 99
Icely, T., 41, 49
Illawarra (N.S.W.), 7, 110, 123
Illustrated Australian Magazine (Melbourne), 155, 163, 200, 203
Independency, *see* Congregationalism
Innes, F. M., 147, 197, 201
Innes, J. L., 192
Ipswich (Qld.), 9, 152
Irby brothers, 76
Irish Democratic Association, 109
Irish Exile (Hobart), 104, 109, 116
Irish settlers: character, 26-7, 104, 110, 114-16; conservative attitude, 31-2, 103-4; nationalism, 25, 104, 110, 116, (Australian) 104; Roman Catholicism, 104, 108, 114-17; support for J. D. Lang, 108, 137; Temperance, 165
Jackson, J. A., 175
Jamison, J., and family, 35, 40, 79, 176
Jarrett, W., 132
Jeffrey, W., 100, 102, 187
Jews, and anti-Semitism, 26, 125, 126, 136, 138, 191
Johnson, R., 13
Johnson, T. R., 192
Jones, D., 128
Jones, R., 54, 68
Jones, — (teetotaller), 182, 183, 195
Jorrocks (racehorse), 37
Josephson, T., 84
Justices of the Peace, 41-2, 43, 54, 101, 120
Kavenagh, L., 198
Kearney, W., and family, 38
Keck, H., 192, 197-8
Kemble, F., 54
Kemp, C., 27-8, 31, 87, 173
Kempston (Tas.), 48
Kentish, N. L., 157, 158, 198, 201, 206
Kerr, W., 137, 139
King, P. G., 118
King, P. P., 41, 46, 50, 62, 74, 105
King's Schools, 23, 69
Knatchbull, J., 32, 162, 174, 180
Knopwood, R., 14
Labour issues, 52-4, 56, 71-2, 89, 92-3, 100-2; *see also* Anti-transportation movement; Coloured labour; Master and Servant legislation
Lamb, J., 54, 95
Land issues: fund for emigration, 24-5, 27, 51, 52-3; leasehold, 51; occupation (Gipps's 1844 regulations) 63; ownership, 47, 51-2, (ideal of) 48; policy, 2-3; price, 29, 50, 51, ('sufficient') 25; sale, 49; squatting, 49, 61-5, (freehold) 64; uses, 49-52, (and labour) 49, 52, *see also* 'Dismemberment' of N.S.W.; Gipps, G.
Lang, A., 48
Lang, G. S., 61, 70
Lang, J. D., 108, 110, 129, 173, 181; and development of schools, 126, 130, (State aid) 130; and evangelicalism 127; and independent Synod, 130; and Methodists (support for) 132; and phrenology, 180; and Temperance, 167, 181; and voluntaryism, 110; attitudes (Anglican claims) 136, (Roman Catholicism) 137, (squatting) 64, 66, 69; missionary activities, 126; on converts to episcopacy, 17; political radical, 87, 93, 97-8, 121, 139, 153, 199; Presbyterian, 140-1, 167; quarrel with McGarvie, 130
Langridge, W., 98, 187
La Trobe, C. J., 65, 168
Laughton, J. B., 137, 198
Launceston (Tas.), 8, 35, 100, 158; anti-transportation, 4, 199, 200-1; Protestantism, 128, 131; Temperance, 165, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 173, 182, 194
Launceston Grammar School, 123
Launceston Mechanics' Institute, 152, 153, 179
Laurie, A., 127, 140
Law and police reform, 191, 196-7
Lawson, N., 81
Lawson, W., 45
Lawson family, 35
Lee, W., 62-3, 67
Leichhardt, L., 32, 160
Leslie brothers, 66
Lhotsky, J., 105
Lillie, J., 187; liberal beliefs, 141, 150, 152, 158; on education, 143; on Temperance, 173; Presbyterian leader, 127, 134, 135

- Literary News* (Sydney), 179
 Liverpool (N.S.W.), 9, 127
 Loch, J. D., 22, 155
 Lockyer, E., 48
 London Missionary Society, 126
 Longford (Tas.), 8, 48, 167
 Longmore, A., 121
 Lord, D., 37
 Lord families, 35
 Lovat, C., 115
 Lowe, R., 45, 80, 106, 173, 192, 196;
 criticizes Sydney Council, 84-5, 191;
 defence of J. Knatchbull, 32, 162,
 174, 180; hostile to aborigines, 67,
 160; on religion and education, 20,
 121, 152, 174-7 *passim*; on squatters
 and land, 51, 63, 64-5, 68, 70, 73;
 radical politician, 47, 79, 83, 87, 92,
 95, 96, 99, 205
 Lunacy and lunatics, 77, 110, 162, 192-3
 Lutheranism, 126
 Lynch, J., 110, 167, 188
 Lyons, S., 83, 87

 McArthur, A., 131
 Macarthur, E., 52, 53
 Macarthur, H., 48, 53-4
 Macarthur, James, 62, 65, 67, 69, 91,
 199; conservative leader, 37, 41, 42-6,
 55, 78, 79, 82, 83; electoral alliance
 with R. Therry, 39, 106; favours
 transportation, 53; hostile to squat-
 ting, 51, 68, 74, 107; opposes gold-
 mining, 52; owner of *Australian*, 33
 Macarthur, John, 36, 40, 74
 Macarthur, W., 41, 46-7, 48, 51, 68
 Macarthur family, 35, 37, 48
 Macdermott, H.: leader of lower-class
 radicalism, 45, 91-2, 94, 95, 205; Syd-
 ney Councillor, 84, 99; sympathy
 with Roman Catholics, 105, 106, 108,
 177
 McEachern, J., 93
 McEncroe, E., 108, 121
 McEncroe, J.: Irish leader, 114, 116;
 leader of aggressive element in
 Roman Catholic Church, 121, 122,
 123; publicist, 104, 107, 112; supports
 moralist movements, 110, 111, 188;
 supports anti-transportation move-
 ment, 108
 McGarvie, J., 24, 84, 127, 130, 136, 140,
 141, 186
 McKaeg, J., 129, 178
 Mackay, J., 72
 Mackenzie, D., 186
 McLachlan, C., 175
 Macleay, A., 25, 55, 83
 Maconochie, A., 26, 31, 111, 160, 162,
 197, 201
 Macquarie, L., 13, 43, 80, 84, 99, 201
 Macquarie, Lake (N.S.W.), 9, 126
 Macquarie River (N.S.W.), 9, 35

 Maitland (N.S.W.), 9, 110, 114, 152,
 167, 169
 Makinson, T. C., 15, 31, 120, 124, 133,
 138, 185-6
 Mansfield, R., 27, 31, 135, 161, 173
 Maps: commentary, 7; New South
 Wales and south Queensland, 9; Tas-
 mania, 8; Victoria and south-east
 South Australia, 8
 Marriage law, 136, 191
 Marriott, F. A., 18, 19, 181
 Marsden, S., 13
 Martin, J., 85-7, 88, 108, 114
 Martin, S., 200
 Master and Servant legislation, 31, 54,
 73, 91, 92, 105, 197
 Mayne, W. C., 192
 Mechanics' Institutes, 151, 152, 153, 157,
 184, 186-7, 189, 203; *see also* under
 Brisbane, Hobart, Launceston, Mel-
 bourne, Sydney, Van Diemen's Land
 Medicine and public health, 158, 162,
 186, 192, 194
 Melbourne (Vic.), 2, 8, 142, 144, 157;
 anti-transportation, 4, 98, 199; build-
 ing societies, 195; mesmerism, 163;
 politics, 63, 106, 139, 193 n.35; popu-
 lation (Vic.) 207-8; religious issues,
 117, 120, 126, 127, 139; Temperance,
 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 181
 Melbourne Benevolent Society, 177
 Melbourne Church of England Mes-
 senger, 15 n.2
 Melbourne Debating Club, 187
 Melbourne Mechanics' Institute, 161,
 163, 186, 194
 Melbourne Union Benefit Society, 194
 Melville, H., 161-2, 163, 174, 175, 179,
 180, 199
 Mercantile interests, 54, 71, 97
 Meredith, L. A., 47
 Mereweather, J. D., 180
 Mesmerism, 162-3, 180
 Methodism, *see* Wesleyanism
 Michie, A., 87, 96, 97, 160
 Midland Agricultural Association, 38,
 39
 Migration of free British settlers to
 Australia, 18, 73; as force towards
 political radicalism, 89-99 *passim*;
 attitudes (gentry's) 43, 44, 52, (*Hier-*
 ald's) 24-5, 29, (pastoralists') 73-4;
 fund to subsidize, 24-5, 27, 51, 52-3;
 Roman Catholic, 119
 Miles, W. A., 192
 Miller, F., 128, 140
 Miller, G., 205
 Missions, 126
 Mitchell, D. S., 39
 Mitchell, T. L., 158
 Mobs, 98-9, 121, 139, 185; *see also* Party
 Processions Prevention legislation

- Molesworth Committee (on transportation), 3, 25, 27, 36, 44, 53, 82, 199
 Molonglo Plains (N.S.W.), 7, 75
 Monaghan, M., 188
Monitor (Sydney), 174-8 *passim*
 Montagu, A., 29, 77, 198
 Moore, J., 101, 108, 166, 172
 Moreau, — (ultra-phrenologist), 164, 180
 Moreton Bay, and District (Qld), 2, 7, 97; Brisbane, 2, 9, 107, 187; politics, 65, 68, 71; Protestantism, 126-7; squatters, 66, 76
 Morgan, J.: anti-Temperance, 166; Orangeman, 117, 137, 139, 177; social reformer, 193, 196, 198; supports radical politics, 100, 102
 Morison, A., 142
 Mormonism and its followers, 126, 129
Morning Advertiser (Hobart), 166
 Mort, T. S., 54
 Mortlock, J. F., 188
 Motherwell, J., 163
 Mowle, P. C., 36
 Mudie, J., 36, 40, 42, 82, 98
 Murphy, F., 106, 112, 114, 115, 118, 123
 Murray, R. L., 175-8 *passim*, 197, 199
 Murray, T. A., 45, 57, 196; Justice of the Peace, 41; on labour, 54, 73; on land, 48, 51, 68, 74; Roman Catholic, 112, 113
 Music, 156, 172
 Mutual Protection Association, 93-4, 99
 Mutual Protection Society, 63
 Myall Creek (N.S.W.), 27, 66

 Nadel, G. H., 150, 186
 Nathan, I., 156
 New England (N.S.W.), 9, 35, 66
 Newham, S., 129
New South Wales Magazine (Sydney), 158, 161, 203
New South Wales (later *Australasian*) *Sporting Magazine*, 37, 157
 New South Wales Temperance Society, 166, 167, 168, 171, 174
 New South Wales Total Abstinence Society, 181
 New Zealand, 25, 61
 Newcastle (N.S.W.), 9, 152
 Nichols, C., 86
 Nichols, G. R., 85-8 *passim*, 104, 108, 177, 197, 198
 Nicholson, C., 55, 64, 72, 83, 202
 Nixon, F. R., 56, 202, and inter-denominational hostility, 21, 110, 120, 131, 135, 136; and transportation, 17, 19; conservative churchman, 14, 16, 22, 132-3; struggle with J. E. Eardley-Wilmot, 19, 20
 Nobbs, — (publican), 168
 Norfolk Island, 3, 25, 26, 111, 197, 199
 Northern Agricultural Association, 38
 Oatlands (Tas.), 48, 135
 O'Brien, H., and family, 39, 49
Observer (Hobart), 135, 136
 O'Connell, D., 25, 26, 30, 91, 104, 110
 O'Connell, M. C., jnr, 17, 91, 106, 120
 O'Connell, M. C., snr, 168
 O'Donohoe, P., 104, 109, 117
 O'Farrell, P. A. C., 112
 Orangeism, 108, 117, 122, 124, 137-9, 177, 178
 Orphan School, Hobart, 191
 Orton, J., 128, 131, 135
 Owenism, 88

 Palmer family, 35
 Panton, J., 45
 Parkes, H., 86, 95, 96, 97, 114, 148, 202
 Parramatta (N.S.W.), 9, 86, 152, 185
Parramatta Chronicle (Sydney), 94
 Party Processions Prevention legislation, 28, 122, 123, 137, 139, 170
 Pastoral Association, 63, 64, 69, 107
 Patrick's Plains (N.S.W.), 7, 41, 46, 168
 'Patriotic Six', 47, 77
 Pedder, J. L., 18, 55, 78
 Penology, 26, 110, 162, 197-8, 201; *see also* Maconochie, A.
 Penrith (N.S.W.), 120, 127
People's Advocate (Sydney), 95-6, 101, 108, 142, 195
 Perry, C., 23, 133; character, 14; clash with Roman Catholicism, 21, 120; on social class, 17; on Temperance, 181; proposed legislation for diocese, 20, 29
 Perth (W. Aust.), 124
 Phrenology, 161-4, 180
 Pidgeon, N., 132
 Piper family, 35, 37
 Pitcairn, R., 100
 Plunkett, J. H., 104, 114, 115, 168
 Polding, J. B., 106, 123; as liberal Roman Catholic, 111-12, 114; intra-Church conflicts, 115-19 *passim*; on colonial morality, 111; on Reformation, 112-13; on Repeal, 104; political attitudes, 105, 109, 121; praised by R. Windeyer, 177; title and status, 21, 31, 118-19, 120, 122; urges Church expansion, 123-4
Politician (Sydney), 34, 80
 Port Phillip (Vic.), 2, 34, 54, 160, 196; education, 185; religious issues, 119, 127, 130-1; separation movement, 21, 30, 55, 65, 79, 98, 157; squatting, 61, 62, 66, 68; *see also* Melbourne
Port Phillip Herald (Melbourne), 177
Port Phillip Magazine (Melbourne), 160
 Portland, 2, 127, 152
 Postal reform, 27, 159
 Powell, E., 70

- Poyser, W., 163, 167, 169-70, 172-3, 174, 206
 Presbyterianism and its followers, 2, 125, 209-10; criticized by W. G. Broughton, 15; demand for status, 133-5; in New South Wales, 127, 130; in Port Phillip, 130-1; in Tasmania, 135, 140, 142; social ethic, 141
Press (Sydney), 97
 Price, C., 128, 153, 158, 165
 Prisoners' Protection Society, 101
 Professional Literary Association, 154
 Protection, 29-30, 54, 92, 93-4, 100
 Prout, J. S., 156, 168, 186
 Pryce, E. G., 16
 Publicans, 41, 166, 190, 194, 200
 Pugh, W. R., 158, 194
 Pye family, 36

 Quaife, B., 128, 132, 142, 198
 Quaker belief and its followers, 126, 132, 155, 165, 171
 Queanbeyan (N.S.W.), 9, 35, 47
 Queensland, *see* Moreton Bay

 Rae, J., 168
 Ramsay, A. M., 131, 139, 144, 181
 Rechabites, 188
Record (Sydney), 15 n.2
 Reed, H., 128, 135, 140
 Reeve, E., 154, 185
 Reibey family, 36
 Religious divisions, 1, 21, 109-10, 120, 137-9
 'Respectability', and its upholders, 40, 88, 94, 157, 187
Review (Hobart), *see* *Tasmanian & Review*
 Ribbonism, 137
 Richmond (Tas.), 38
 Riddell, C. D., 25, 42, 55
 Rigney, J., 110, 123, 188
 Robertson, C., 127
 Robinson, J. P., 63, 65, 191
 Rodd family, 36
 Roman Catholic Church and its followers, 4, 5, 6, 127, 128, 133, 134, 136, 168, 209-10; and Temperance, 110-11, 119, 120, 167, 171, 181, 188, 189; criticized, 15, 21, 26-7, 31-2, 137-9; drive towards status and power, 117-24; gentry sympathizers, 39, 45; internal disputes, 113-16; liberal-radical sympathies and sympathizers, 91, 103-13, 153, 176-7
 Ross, R., 128, 136, 138, 143
 Rossi, F., 41, 46
 Rouse family, 35, 38
 Rousseau, J. J., 34, 148
 Royal Society of Van Diemen's Land, 157, 158
 Rusden, G. W., 34, 154, 184-5
 Russell, F. T. C., 133

 Russell, J., 2, 44, 50, 82-3
 Russell family, 39, 69, 195
 Ryrie, G., 52

 Sabbatarianism, 19, 29, 111, 141, 192
 St Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, 15
 St Francis's Church, Melbourne, 122, 123
 St James Grammar School, Sydney, 23
 St John's Church, Canberra, 112
 St Julian, C., 108, 113
 St Mary's Cathedral, Sydney, 115
 St Patrick's Church, Sydney, 114, 115, 121, 123
 St Patrick's Society, 122, 123
 St Patrick's Total Abstinence Society, 122
 Salting, S. K., 54, 72
 Saunders, J., 168, 181, 206; achievement for Temperance, 167; anti-Roman Catholic, 139; anti-transportation, 199; Baptist, 128-9, 136; forswears tobacco, 171; on Christianity and Temperance, 182; on education, 143, 168; Temperance publicist, 166, 169, 173; urges restriction of liquor trade, 170, 190
 Savings Banks, 91-2, 188, 194-5, 205
 Science, 157-61, 179-80
 Sconce, R. K., 15, 31, 48, 120, 124, 137, 138, 185-6
 Scott, D. C. F., 37
 Scott, H., 41
 Scott, R., 48, 68
 Scott, T. H., 14, 36
 Scott family, 37, 41, 42, 48
 Self-government, 44, 77-9, 87, 97, 108, 109; *see also* Eardley-Wilmot, J. E.; Wentworth, W. C.
 Self-help, 98, 193-5; *see also* Benefit societies; Savings Banks
Sentinel (Sydney), 137-9
 Sherwin, I., 182, 194
 Shoalhaven (N.S.W.), 9, 48
 Sidney brothers, 89
 Singleton, J., 171
 Singleton (N.S.W.), 9, 152
 Sisters of Charity, 110, 116
 Smidmore, T., 99
 Smith, Dr, 162
 Snodgrass, K., 134
 Social science, 160-1, 162, 180; *see also* Penology; Phrenology
 Society for the Propagation of the Charities, &c. of the Gospel, 101
 Sorell (Tas.), 8, 135
 South Australia, 8, 25, 61, 134
Southern Queen (Sydney), 15 n.2, 180
 Sparks, T., 86
 Spence, R., 188
 Sport, 37-8, 41, 86, 157, 173, 206
 Stackhouse, A., 182-3
Standard (Sydney), 15 n.2

- Standard of Tasmania* (Hobart), 167
 Stanley, E. G. G. S., 5, 61, 63, 118
Star and Working Man's Guardian (Sydney), 94
 State aid: for religion, 4-5, 18-19, 118, 119-20, 128, 130-6, 190; for schools, 5, 27, 191, (Anglican) 18, 175, (denominational) 5, 6, 18, (Protestant) 5, (Roman Catholic) 5; *see also* Church and Schools Corporation
 Statham, E. H., 33
 Steam-power, 158, 159
 Steel family, 36
 Stephen, A., 82, 168, 181
 Stephen, J., 78, 118, 191
 Stephens, W., 24, 32
 Stiles, H. T., 135, 143
 Stokes, F. M., 24
 Stroud (N.S.W.), 9, 48
 Strzlecki, P. E. de, 49
Sun (Sydney), 166, 170, 181-2
 Sunday Schools, 125
 Sutherland, B., 93, 96
 Suttor, G., 48
 Sydney (N.S.W.), 2, 9, 98, 127, 142, 153, 163, 193, 194; anti-transportation, 4; legislature elections, 83, 87, 108; police and security, 84, 92; population (N.S.W.) 207-8; railway to Parramatta, 185; Temperance, 166, 167, 171, 187, 188, 189
 Sydney College, 69, 80, 84, 157
 Sydney Council: basic history and significance, 82-5; incorporation opposed as tax measure, 44, 106; link with radicalism, 91, 94; link with Roman Catholicism, 105, 106, 108, 139; public health, 192; Temperance, 170
Sydney Gazette, 26, 137
 Sydney Mechanics' Institute, 28, 157, 160, 181, 186, 187
Sydney Morning Herald, 23, 49, 162; conservative views of society, 24-33, 34, 57, 83, 118, 202; hostility (to Roman Catholics and Irish) 106, 137, (to squatting) 63-9 *passim*, 74, 76, (to Temperance extremism) 173, 174; supports A. Michie, 87; sympathy for elements of progress, 149, 159, 195, 196
Sydney Protestant Magazine, 126, 138
Sydney Times, 157
 Sydney Total Abstinence Society, 181
 Tahiti, 139
 Tankard, — (teetotaler), 187
 Tarban Creek (N.S.W.), 7, 9, 192
Tasmanian & Review (Hobart), 147, 175, 176, 177, 199
 Tasmanian Teetotal Society, 166
 Tasmanian Total Abstinence Agency Association, 167
 Tasmanian Union, 101-2, 109
Tasmanian Weekly Dispatch (Hobart), 196
 Tawell, J., 171
Teetotal Advocate (Launceston), 166, 170
Teetotaler and General Newspaper (Sydney), 166, 168
 Temperance, 6, 128, 156, 195; and Christian theology, 180-2; basic history, 165-74; impact on society, 187-90, 203, 205, 206; links (with anti-transportation) 200, 201, (with self-help) 193, 194; support for (Protestant) 143-4, (Roman Catholic) 110-11, 119, 120
Temperance Advocate (Sydney), 166-71 *passim*, 202
Temperance Banner (Hobart), 167, 195
 Terry, S., 84, 129
 Therry, J. J., 105, 109, 112-19 *passim*, 123, 139
 Therry, R., 46, 55, 120, 168; elected to legislature (1843), 39, 45, 106, 120; liberal Roman Catholic, 110, 111, 114, 115; personal and political associate of R. Bourke, 25, 42, 104, 105
 Thomson, J., 134
 Threlkeld, L. E., 126
 Thurlow, W., 88
 Tindal, C., 65
 Tocqueville, A. de, 56, 103, 165, 202, 203
 Tractarian movement, 21, 88; criticism (by liberals) 176, (by Protestants) 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, (of Temperance) 181; influence on local Church of England, 14-15, 20
 Trade unions, 89, 90, 98, 100, 102, 107
 Transcendentalism, 147, 155, 172, 173; *see also* Harpur, C.
 Transportation of convicts: history and discussion, 3-4, 53, 56, 71-2, 73, 82; *see also* Anti-transportation movement; Molesworth Committee
 Trollope, W., 112
True Catholic (Hobart), 126, 138
 Turner, N., 128, 131
 Tyrrell, W., 14
 Udney, Dr, 179
 Ullathorne, W. B., 118, 121; anti-transportation, 177, 199; consecrated bread story, 122-3; political manoeuvring, 104, 105, 111, 118; relations with J. B. Polding, 112, 115; supports Temperance, 110
 Union Club, Hobart, 38
 Unitarianism, 126
 University of Sydney, 23, 113, 151, 152, 157, 179, 184, 191
 Usury legislation, 30, 49

- Van Diemen's Land Temperance Herald* (Launceston), 166, 181
 Van Diemen's Land Mechanics' School of Arts, 187
 Van Diemen's Land Total Abstinence Society, 181
 Verge, J., 37
 Victoria, *see* Melbourne; Port Phillip
 Victoria Harbour, 124
 Voluntaryism, 96, 110, 133, 136, 139, 177

 Wade, W. R., 158
 Wagga Wagga (N.S.W.), 9, 185
 Wakefield, E. G., 25, 29, 51, 74, 82
 Waldron family, 36
 Walker, G. W., 126, 165, 167, 181, 187, 189, 194
 Walker, T., 37
 Wallace, F. L., 83
 Walthall, C. E., 48
 Watchorn, W., 101-2
 Watson, W., 126
 Webb, W. P., 203
Weekly Register (Sydney), 106-7
 Wellington Valley (N.S.W.), 7, 9, 126
 Wentworth, W. C., 88, 94, 95, 196; as squire, 40, 49, 51; attacked by C. Harpur and W. A. Duncan, 107; deplores miscegenation, 76; hostility (to radicalism) 91, 94, 97, (to Temperance) 173; leadership (faction in legislature, from 1848) 85, 86, (squattling interest) 63, 65, 68, 69; local politics, 80, 83, 84; Roman Catholic interest, 105, 106, 108, 176; secularist, 179, 191; self-government, 31, 44, 45, 47, 77, 78, 79; supports transportation, 53, 72; university (foundation) 151
 Wentworth family, 35, 37
 Wesleyan Missionary Committee, 28
 Wesleyanism, its followers and break-aways, 4, 5, 56, 84, 125-32 *passim*, 135-6, 140, 171, 209-10
 West, J.: anti-transportation, 198, 200; Congregationalist, 128, 132, 136, 142; journalist, 33; on art, 156; on colonial society, 99, 195, 205; on religious issues, 120, 129, 133
 Western District (Port Phillip), 8, 62, 65, 66
 Westgarth, W., 159, 161, 179-80, 189, 199
 Weston, — (pastoralist), 63
 White, P., 39
 Wigmore, T., 132
 Wilcox, J., 129
 Wilkins, W., 154
 Williams, J., 100
 Willis, J. W., 119
 Wills, H., 65
 Willson, R. W., 110, 113, 116-17, 120, 139, 192
 Wilmington, W., 72
 Wilmot, W. B., 163, 178-9
 Wilshire, J. R., 84, 95, 96, 97, 121
 Windeyer, C., 189
 Windeyer, R., 45, 83, 196; and credit for landowners, 30, 49; and franchise (educational qualification) 152; and self-government, 77, 79; hostility (to squatting) 64, 65, (to Temperance extremists) 174; sympathy (for aborigines) 161, (for Jews) 191, (for J. B. Polding) 177; voting (as electorate representative) 99
 Windsor (N.S.W.), 9, 70, 135
 Women: and abstinence, 182; and Temperance, 169, 206; and moral enlightenment, 200; education, 154; legal reforms, 197; political privilege, 205-6
 Woolfrey, H. N., 116-17
 Woolls, W., 133
 Wright, J. A., 37, 39
 Wroe, J., 127, 129
 Wyndham, G., 37, 69

 Yass (N.S.W.), 38, 39
 Yeoman farming, 50, 70-1, 90, 92, 93, 96, 107
 Young, T., 102

 Zoist (London), 162, 174

MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY PRESS
IN ASSOCIATION WITH
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY